

# THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

FEBRUARY, 1840.

## THE PRESENT CONFLICT

BETWEEN THE

## ECCLESIASTICAL AND CIVIL POWERS OF SCOTLAND;

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE KIRK.

BY SIR CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, BART.\*

POPERY was abolished in Scotland in 1560, by an Act of the Scotch Parliament. In 1558, Elizabeth had ascended the throne of England, and Popery had the second time been abolished in that country. The Reformation in the northern part of the island differed from that in the south, by its being altogether a popular movement, and by the circumstance that the Scotch Parliament substituted no ecclesiastical system for that which it had displaced.

The Act of Parliament passed on the 24th August. On the 20th December, the first "General Assembly" of reformed ministers and laymen, self-called and self-organised, met in Scotland. This association, with the societies of Christians connected with it, was called the "Kirk." The body adopted, in the same year, the first book of discipline, drawn up principally by John Knox—the chief actor in that mighty movement by which popery had just been disestablished. The first book of discipline embodied the main features of Presbyterianism, such as they exist at present in Scotland. Under that system, all ministers or elders are considered on an equality; some being termed preaching, and some ruling, elders. The preaching and lay elders of from four to forty congregations constitute a presbytery, whose principal function consists in licensing competent

\* This article forms part of a series of Letters published by the worthy Baronet in the *Herb's Reformer*, but as it supplies a valuable abstract of the controversy which now agitates the whole of Scotland, and is likely to produce the most important results, we are happy to reprint it by his permission for the information of thousands who have never seen that able provincial journal.—EDITOR.

persons to preach, and in ordaining to cures of souls those who are called or appointed to that office. Superior to the presbyteries are the synods, of which there are sixteen in Scotland. These review the proceedings of the presbyteries; and at the half-yearly meeting of each synod, one individual at least from each presbytery is required to attend, and to produce the minutes of the proceedings of the presbytery. Over the whole of the foregoing tribunals the General Assembly presides. With this body resides the legislative authority of the kirk, subject to the consent of a majority of presbyteries to each law enacted. It will be perceived that the presbyterian system, though its advocates were, and still are, most vehemently opposed to the episcopalian, is in some respects identical with it, the names of offices only being altered, and considerable popular power, or appearance of power, being introduced into the machinery. As Milton said, "New presbyter is but old priest, writ large." Presbyteries are archdeaconries, with the addition of the power of ordination. Synods are sees. A synod means "coming together." A see means "a seat,"—the bishop sits alone, the elders come together for conference. The general assembly corresponds with the archiepiscopal authority. Under both systems the same idea prevails, that local Societies of Christians require external superintendence. Under both, there is a manifest yearning after an embodiment, in a substantial and tangible form, of "the church" of an entire nation. The New Testament speaks of "churches," and of "a church." The former, it is agreed, are local societies of professing Christians. The latter, Presbyterians and Episcopalians believe to mean a grand and comprehensive organization, equally perceptible to the senses with the visible local societies. All other Christians believe that the church of Christ means an invisible aggregate of dispersed Christians, united by a common faith and love, but not by any centralised authority.

At the time that the presbyterian system branched off from the episcopalian in Scotland, it partook much more of the episcopalian character, and aspired to a much more offensive authority, than most sensible Presbyterians would claim for it at present. In 1567, Presbyterianism being still unestablished, the General Assembly deposed the Bishop of Orkney, for transgressing the act of the kirk in marrying the Queen (Mary) to Bothwell. Now the bishop, from the very name of his office, was not a Presbyterian. The Queen, certainly, was a Roman Catholic. What right had a number of private and unauthorized individuals to interfere with matters pertaining to persons not being of their own communion? The answer lies in the claim of the kirk to be, what unhappily an Act of Parliament, in the year 1567, proclaimed it for the first time to be, "the only true and holy kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm." This theory, in fact, lies at the root of all religious establishments. It may suit modern defenders to suppose, that the state selects the religious teachers of one, out of several bodies of Christians, as an expedient means of moralizing the nation, by bringing home gratuitous religious instruction to all who are willing to accept it. Such, however, was not the origin of any

national establishment. The view adopted and acted upon, on both sides of the Tweed, at the time of the Reformation, was that the entire civil society of a country, regarded under an ecclesiastical aspect, is "a church." The utility of preaching was by no means the chief motive for endowing a priesthood. Preaching was looked upon as only one out of many effects of antecedent organization. Discipline and the sacraments were regarded as even more important than the pulpit. In so far as their first idea of a church was that of "a society," a body subjected to strict rules, admitting persons solemnly within its pale on certain conditions, excluding them if those conditions are violated, and stately meeting for the celebration of the Lord's death, the theory of our ancestors appears to me to have been far more in harmony with the original institution, than the utilitarian views of many excellent defenders of the establishment principle of late years. The application of those early views was, indeed, erroneous; the godly society was made up of an ungodly population;—the theoretical discipline became null in practice. There was an abuse of principles in themselves right,—principles which are too much lost sight of by those who regard a national clergy as mere lecturers—mere channels for indoctrinating the people.

Episcopacy was stunned, but not killed, by the great revolution which had overwhelmed it. Within two or three years of the Presbyterian system being proclaimed by Parliament to be the "only true Kirk," the Government without consulting the clergy, bestowed on certain christian teachers the office and emoluments of prelates; and in 1571, the prelates were made peers of Parliament. The popular feeling was thereby aroused to resistance. In 1572, the General Assembly of the Kirk, which met at Leith and is known to history as the "Convention of Leith," appointed six of its members to meet an equal number of the Privy Council; in consequence of which a compromise was agreed to by a subsequent assembly at Perth, depriving the bishops of their parliamentary honours, but embodying a modified episcopacy. Three years had not elapsed, when the clergy began to feel that the convention of Leith had conceded too much. During this interval John Knox had died,—an event, say the modern defenders of the semi-episcopal platform of Leith, which let loose the violent zeal of the presbyterian party, and carried them further than Knox himself would have been willing to go. This opinion is chiefly founded upon the fact, that under the system developed in the "first book of discipline," there were to be "superintendents," as well as synods and presbyteries,—an office corresponding in name, as well as in some of its functions, with *episcopus* or bishop. On the other hand it is asserted that this office was always meant to be only temporary. However this may be, the Assembly which met in April, 1576, decided that "the name of a bishop belonged to all who were in the pastoral office;" and ordained, that every so-called bishop should make choice of one congregation of which he might take particular charge. Some of the bishops yielded, and some disobeyed,—the conflict continuing for several years. In 1578, James the Sixth having in the preceding

year deposed the Regent Morton, and assumed the government at the age of twelve years, the General Assembly adopted the "second book of discipline," and carried it to the foot of the throne. The controversy now going on in Scotland, very much turns upon the question whether this book is a standard of the Established Church. That it is a standard of the kirk there is no doubt,—but that the state ever adopted it *in toto*, or that the kirk had received power from the state to enact the parts of it relating to temporalities I believe to be contrary to history. It takes very high ground as to the independence of the church on the state. It declares that "the order which God's word craved cannot stand with patronage." The object of its framers, says Mr. Hope in his letter to the Lord Chancellor, was to invest the church with authority, which might controul the state in almost every department. It skilfully confuses the proper spiritual authority of a church over its willing members, with the ecclesiastical supremacy of an established church over the state and the law. "This power ecclesiastical," it is asserted, "flowis immediatlie from God and the mediatur Jesus Christ, and is spirituall not having a temporal head on earth, but onlie Christ, the onlie spirituall King and Governor of his Kirk." The power of election to ecclesiastical charges is claimed for presbyteries; and the jurisdiction of the church is expounded in terms so extensive, that had the state really adopted it, the whole power of the state would, in Mr. Hope's words, have been prostrated before it.

As the claims of the kirk rose, the spirit of the young king and his parliament rose also. The young king appointed Robert Montgomery, Archbishop of Glasgow. The Assembly deposed him. The king commanded them to desist from their proceedings against him. The kirk "decerned the sentence of fearful excommunication to be pronounced" against the archbishop; and Montgomery "in the face of the hail Assemblie," acknowledged his error and promised submission. As soon, however, as the Assembly broke up, he resumed his attempts to gain possession of his bishopric. The Presbytery of Edinburgh fulminated a decree of excommunication against the bishop, and the king immediately annulled it by an act of Privy Council.

In 1584 the Black Acts, as they are called, were passed. The king perceived that if the state did not conquer the kirk, the kirk would shortly swallow up the powers of the state; and the Scotch parliament readily seconded his wishes. All existing church authority was repealed, and the royal power over all estates, spiritual as well as temporal, was confirmed. It was ordained, that certain bishops and commissioners named by the king should exercise ecclesiastical authority, and arrange all ecclesiastical matters within their dioceses. A considerable part of the clergy fled to England,—the party who had sided with them were prostrate and powerless—and the "state" was for a time triumphant over the "church."

In 1587, Mary, the deposed Queen of Scotland, was tried and executed in England, upon an accusation of treasonable conspiracy against Elizabeth. James felt himself totally unable to avenge this atrocious violation of justice and international law. The source

of his  
relig  
of th  
of th  
howe  
ont  
1592  
the  
cure  
158  
priv  
kirk  
cati  
esse  
wor  
and  
astr  
pres  
ack  
stoc  
pat  
I  
and  
two  
154  
gra  
res  
up  
ma  
spi  
ric  
thr  
ju  
Gl  
of  
inv  
of  
pr  
lia  
bi  
G  
E  
M  
th  
16  
y  
sy  
o  
se  
th

of his weakness he perceived to lie in the feuds, especially the religious feuds, of Scotland. In 1588 he consented to the repeal of the Black Acts of 1584, and to the re-construction by the kirk of the whole form of presbyterian government. The church lands, however, were vested in the crown, and the incomes of the clergy out of the tithes remained limited and precarious. The Act of 1592 is that, to which the advocates of the kirk point, as containing the recognition by the state of the authority claimed in respect of cures by the second book of discipline. It enacts that the Act of 1584 "sall nowise be prejudiciall nor derogate onie thing to the privilege that God has given to the spirituall office bearers in the kirk, concerning heads of religion, maters of heresie, excommunication, *collation or deprivation of ministers*, or any sich like essentiall censours, specially groundend and havand warrant of the word of God." The book of discipline is not mentioned by name; and it is specifically provided that the "presbyteries be bound and astricted to receive and admit quhatsumever qualified minister presented be his Majestie or laic patrons." The preceding general acknowledgment of the authority of the kirk can hardly be understood to over-ride so distinct a saving clause as to the rights of patrons.

In 1603 James succeeded Elizabeth in the throne of England, and the two crowns were thenceforth united, the parliaments of the two countries continuing to be separate. In the interval between 1592 and 1603, James had again laboured to undo the concessions granted to the presbyterian clergy. In 1597, Parliament had restored the political rank of prelates, by giving them votes in the upper house, leaving it, with the utmost quaintness, to the king's majesty to settle with the General Assembly the nature of the spiritual office, which the *bishops* should exercise in the *Presbyterian Church*. As soon as James felt himself secure on the English throne, he restored their temporal emoluments and ancient civil jurisdiction to the bishops. In 1610 the General Assembly at Glasgow actually passed an Act, appointing the bishops moderators of synod, and investing them with spiritual, as Parliament had invested them with temporal, authority. The modern supporters of the kirk quote this suicidal act of the General Assembly as a proof that the kirk was then independent of the state, because Parliament did not touch the ecclesiastical question.

Episcopacy was now again in the ascendant; but though the bishops established a High Commission Court, the presbyterian General Assemblies continued to be called by royal authority. Episcopal worship was performed in the Chapel Royal at Edinburgh. Most of the clergy now gave in their adherence to episcopacy, and those who opposed themselves were imprisoned or banished. In 1617, the kirk consummated its own degradation by agreeing to yield several points, embodying the substance of the episcopalian system. Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, confirmation, and the observance of fasts and festivals, are indeed unimportant in themselves, as being mere circumstantialia; but both parties regarded them as questions of principle, inasmuch as they were the recog-

nized appendages of a system which the Presbyterians had denounced as anti-christian.

In the same year Parliament appointed a commission "with power to appoint and assign out of the teinds of every parish a perpetual local stipend to the ministers present and to come," which was the first step after the Reformation towards the regular endowment of the clergy. James died in 1625; and in 1628 his son, Charles I. undertook to complete the settlement of the tithes. On the 2d of September, 1629, he issued four decreets, arbitral, which were afterwards sanctioned by Parliament, under which heritors (or land owners) were empowered to draw their own tithes. One-fifth of the rent (to be ascertained by valuation) was to remain payable by the heritors in lieu of tithes. This arrangement extended, with some variations, to bishop's tithes,—now vested in the Crown, being the source from whence the prelates were paid,—and to tithes belonging, whether to public bodies or to titulars, (lay impropriators.) Private titulars were bound to sell their tithes to the heritors, for nine years' purchase of the ascertained value. Thus, more than two centuries before the commutation of tithes in England, that impost, if not extinguished in name, was limited in amount in Scotland. To this circumstance much of the agricultural prosperity of the northern kingdom may be traced. Unfortunately the plan has never been quite completed, and many of the teind records have been lost and destroyed. Many parishes, however, were valued, and the commissioners, out of the value, proceeded to assign stipends to the clergy. A century later, the Court of Session, (or highest civil court in Scotland,) was invested with the powers of the teind commissioners. There are now few teinds which have not been valued; but in many instances the value is not exhausted by the stipends charged upon it.

In 1637, Charles, with the aid of his Privy Council, determined to introduce the English liturgy into the Scotch churches. On the 23d July, the first attempt was made in St. Giles's Church, at Edinburgh. The populace resisted, and the lives of the clergy and officers of state were with difficulty saved. Charles had aroused a storm which he was unable to appease. The tide rapidly turned against him. In vain he offered to make partial, and even extensive concessions. A solemn league and covenant was entered into for the abolition of episcopacy; and in the same year the General Assembly destroyed, with a single vote, the ecclesiastical fabric which James and Charles had for forty years been engaged in rearing. I will not trouble your readers with a history of the dethronement and execution of Charles. Episcopacy was abolished in England; and on June 12th, 1647, the English Parliament summoned an assembly of learned men to settle the government of the church. The assembly met at Westminster, and was assisted by commissioners from the Scotch General Assembly. The confession of faith, then agreed to, was adopted by the kirk on the 27th August, 1647, and ratified by the Scotch Parliament in 1648. The Westminster catechism is to Scotland what the Anglican catechism is to England; and it is remarkable that England should have given to Scot-

land  
respe  
In l  
age,  
fiere  
their  
the n  
In  
was  
cusa  
thos  
the r  
Scot  
asce  
una  
ham  
men  
Par  
prel  
and  
The  
pat  
"a  
the  
the  
legi  
sinc  
men  
I  
into  
mo  
Scot  
7  
in  
it v  
fro  
and  
hav  
res  
rec  
da  
a n  
ins  
in  
co  
th  
co  
gr  
we  
du  
ex

land a formulary which it has not retained itself, though in many respects less objectionable than the catechism in the Prayer-Book. In 1649, patrons of parishes, having been deprived of their patronage, were compensated out of the tithes; for even in those times of fierce democracy, it was never contemplated to denude patrons of their rights without compensation. Such injustice was reserved for the nineteenth century.

In 1660 Charles II. was restored to the throne. The "league" was pronounced treasonable—Episcopacy was re-established; recusant ministers were ejected, and 350 parishes (above one-third of those in Scotland) were at once declared vacant. Persecution of the most odious character, and to the most awful extent, pervaded Scotland during this and the following reigns. James the Second ascended the throne in 1685, and was expelled from it by the almost unanimous voice of both kingdoms in 1688. His son-in-law, William III. was invited to the vacant throne by the English Parliament, and was acknowledged as their sovereign by the Scotch Parliament, on the 22d March, 1689. By the Scotch Act of 1690, prelacy was again and finally abolished, presbytery was revived, and the Westminster Confession of Faith ratified and established. The Act of 1592 was re-enacted, except that part of it relating to patronages, which was reserved for future consideration. The law "asserting his Majesty's supremacy," which had been passed in the reign of Charles II., was formally repealed. The defenders of the recent proceedings of the General Assembly assert that the legislation at the revolution attests the independence of the kirk, since the Acts then passed enacted no new ecclesiastical matter, and merely repealed the unjust laws of previous Parliaments.

It is very remarkable that exactly a century and a half should have intervened between that event and the circumstances which at this moment seem to threaten the speedy overthrow of the kirk of Scotland.

The question of patronage was reserved for future consideration in the Act of 1690 restoring the temporalities of the kirk. I believe it was by a separate act, that patronage was subsequently transferred from the hands of the lay patrons to the heritors (or landowners) and elders of parishes. In 1711, the union of England and Scotland having taken place about four years previously, patronage was again restored to the lay patrons by the *British* Parliament. Opposite reasons are assigned by the two parties in the kirk at the present day, for this return to a practice which diminishes the probability of a minister harmonising with his people. The opponents of patronage insinuate that the change was attributable to the English ingredients in the united parliament, and to the desire on the part of an episcopal senate and an immoral minister (Bolingbroke) to assimilate the Scotch system of presentations to the low standard of the southern country. The low church party on the other hand, assert with a great show of truth, that the semi-popular system of appointment worked exceedingly ill; so much faction and irritation being produced by it, that it became, they say, not only justifiable but highly expedient to recur to the soothing and pacifying plan of entrusting

the nomination of the people's minister to a patron, often non-resident, and almost as often of a different creed from the members of the minister's flock.

The tendency of such a system cannot be doubted. If popular election to an office the stipend of which the electors do not pay, is likely to lead to unseemly broils; on the other hand the dictation of a stranger can lead but to one of two consequences. Under such a plan, accordance of sentiment between the pastor and the people will be the exception, and disagreement or want of affection will be the rule. Where the latter is the case, persons who are really in earnest about their own souls, will naturally separate themselves from a connection with which they have no sympathy; while the forms of religion will take the place of its spiritual reality amongst those who remain. I say not that such is the invariable effect of patronage, but it is its uniform tendency.

The result in Scotland coincided with this supposition. In the beginning of the 18th century, evangelical religion steadily declined within the Established Church. Among the clergy it well nigh disappeared, taking refuge, wherever it did survive, among the people; the children and grandchildren of the covenanters. From the representative nature of the kirk, the local state of religion will speedily affect the corporate character and proceedings of the whole institution. The tone of the General Assembly is greatly influenced by the average tone of religion among the Scotch ministers and people. Need it be wondered that the ecclesiastical Parliament shortly began to manifest a bitter opposition to serious piety, and an uniform readiness to side with patrons in forcing unacceptable clergymen upon reluctant congregations. Though the right of presentation had been restored to the patrons, the actual introduction to the cure still continued to rest with the presbytery "of the bounds," that is, of the district, in which the parish is situated. On such occasions, the presbytery is entitled to inquire into the literature and manners of the presentee, and can take cognizance of any matter, proveable by evidence, which renders a clergyman unfit for the cure. A presbytery, sympathising with the people, could in many cases prevent, by a proper exercise of authority, the installment of an individual of manifest and flagrant unfitness. Few were the presbyteries of such a character! The feelings of the people were almost universally disregarded. The "call," addressed by the flock to their intended pastor, which had once been something like a reality, though it still remained a necessary preliminary to legal induction, degenerated into a mere form; often being signed by only a few persons out of large congregations. The General Assembly supported their dependent presbyteries in their hostility to the asserted christian rights of the people; and should any presbytery have virtue, and independence, and sound religion enough to decline being the instrument of such galling tyranny, the Assembly would appoint a "riding commission," to visit the scene of rebellion, and induct the objectionable ministers, "riding rough shod, booted and spurred," as some one has described it, "over the religious liberties of the nation." Such a policy soon bore its natural fruits.

The  
Ers  
Th  
of L  
war  
body  
and  
resp  
take  
the  
Fron  
and  
nect  
bod  
Scot  
in o  
the  
flow  
ness  
sem  
the  
in S  
easy  
fall  
true  
effe  
syst  
pos  
whi  
othe  
mus  
org  
an  
com  
nat  
rali  
S  
long  
ber.  
rais  
her  
The  
tim  
god  
side  
cler  
to v  
Sco  
lar  
Ed  
ext

The first secession took place in 1733, and was headed by Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, Alexander Moncrief, and James Fisher. These persons met at Gairney Bridge, near Kinross, and on the 6th of December in that year formed themselves into a presbytery, afterwards known by the name of the "Associate Presbytery." The body increasing, it was afterwards termed the "Associate Synod;" and was subsequently (in 1747) split into two sections, denominated respectively the Burgher, and Anti-burgher, Synod, from the views taken by each of the "burgess oath," the consistency of which with the secession testimony one party defended and the other denied. From both the bodies some further separations have taken place, and one of these diverging parties has, during the year 1839, connected itself again with the Established Church. The two main bodies, however, constitute the mass of Presbyterian Seceders in Scotland, and on the 8th of September, 1820, these were reunited in one society, under the name of the "United Associate Synod of the Secession Church." While the life blood of the kirk was thus flowing away from it, it is needless to say that formalism, worldliness, and hostility to serious piety, prevailed in the General Assembly. Had such continued to be the character of the kirk up to the present time, it is difficult to say what might have been the effect in Scotland of the present agitation against establishments. It is easy to say that a bad establishment would have been more likely to fall than a good one. To me, however, the reverse appears to be true. The fall of a bad, or irreligious establishment, can only be effected by the conviction on the part of the legislature that the system is injurious to the national welfare; and a national legislature possessing more religion than a national church is a phenomenon which, as far as I know, the world has never yet witnessed. On the other hand an establishment, the spiritual state of which is flourishing, must, if I am not mistaken, ere long adopt principles of christian organization, which though scripturally right, are, when applied to an established church, utterly inconsistent with the security of the commonwealth. The spirituality of an establishment is thus, in the nature of things, far more likely to lead to the loss of its temporalities, than its want of spirituality.

Such has been the experience of the church of Scotland. For a long period after the original secession, the kirk continued to slumber. In vain did the pious few who still adhered to her communion, raise their faithful testimony against her declension in religion, and her unhesitating submission to the secular institution of patronage. The evangelical party in the General Assembly constituted for a long time a very insignificant minority. The general spread of vital godliness, however, which has been so manifest of late years on both sides of the Tweed, has no where been more rapid than among the clergy of the kirk. I may be mistaken; but such is the conclusion to which, as an impartial observer, I came during a recent visit to Scotland. To this happy result no one has, under God, been a larger contributor than Dr. Chalmers. As professor of divinity at Edinburgh, the rising generation of ministers has passed, to a great extent, through his hands. The weight of his character, and the

brilliance of his abilities, have had a powerful and salutary effect upon the members of the General Assembly. Thus, both indirectly and directly, Dr. Chalmers has been the means of turning the balance of power in that body, until in the year 1834 an evangelical majority was obtained, and the Veto Act, having been brought forward in another shape in 1833 and rejected, was finally passed. By this measure it is made a rule of the kirk, that if the majority of male heads of families being communicants forbid the induction of a presentee (whence the word *veto*), the Presbytery shall forthwith refuse to "take him upon trials," or to give ecclesiastical force to the presentation.

I shall not attempt to state all the reasons which have been urged for and against this measure. Suffice it to say, that with a few exceptions on one side and the other, it may be generally stated that the evangelical party are in favour of the veto, and their opponents are against it. The rationale of this difference is evident. A consistent evangelical Christian, who believes religion to consist in an entire change in the heart and character, operated by the Spirit of God, and who believes that change to have taken place in himself, esteems as brethren all who "have obtained like precious faith with him," and does not regard as a Christian in the true sense, any man, whatever his status in the nominal church, whom he believes to be yet a stranger to regenerating grace. To such a man, the difference between a pious Christian, and a person of a contrary character, is all the difference between light and darkness. But to a man who does not entertain evangelical opinions, every communicant is equally a member of the church of Christ, every clergyman is equally a minister of the gospel. The evangelical member of the General Assembly will therefore sympathise with a congregation, wishing to prevent the intrusion of "a preacher of another gospel, which is not a gospel," while the low churchman (as the anti-evangelical party are termed in Scotland) will, necessarily, have no such feeling.

It now remains to state the practical results of this measure; results which, if confidence can be placed in great principles, must terminate in the subversion of the Scottish establishment.

The first case which arose under the veto law, was the celebrated Auchterarder question. Mr. Robert Young, a licentiate of the church, was presented, by the Earl of Kinnoul, to the parish of Auchterarder. His appointment was vetoed by the communicants, only two persons, it is said, and those under obligations to the patron, signing the call in his favour. The Presbytery refused to induct. The presentee appealed to the higher ecclesiastical tribunals, which confirmed the decision of the Presbytery. He then appealed to the Court of Session, the highest civil court in Scotland, who pronounced a decision in his favour, and found "that Lord Kinnoul had legally, validly, and effectually exercised his rights as patron, and that the Presbytery had acted to the prejudice of the pursuer, illegally, and in violation of their duty, and contrary to the provision of the statutes." The Presbytery referred themselves for direction to the General Assembly, which met in May, 1838. It was there resolved to appeal to the House of Lords; where, after the

most ample arguments, the judgment of the Court of Session was, in May, 1839, affirmed, the Lord Chancellor and Lord Brougham declaring that they never entertained a doubt on the subject. The law of the land has thus declared that there is an obligation upon Presbyteries to induct any presentee whose moral character and orthodoxy are irreproachable, without reference to his accordance with the religious feelings of the people. Mr. Young has it in his power either to apply to the court to compel the Presbytery to induct, or to sue the Presbyteries for damages for the loss of his stipend. It is understood that he is about to pursue the latter course.

The next case which arose was that of Lethendy, in the Presbytery of Dunkeld (Perthshire). In 1835, Mr. Clark was appointed by the Crown (the patron), on the application of the then incumbent, to be his assistant and successor in that place. Being vetoed by the people, the Crown appointed another clergyman, Mr. Kessen. As soon as Mr. Clark received notice of this second appointment, he applied to the Court of Session for an interdict, forbidding the Presbytery to give effect to the presentation. The injunction was granted, but was disobeyed by the Presbytery; who acting by the advice of the General Assembly of May, 1838, proceeded in defiance of the court to settle and induct Mr. Kessen. For this offence the members of the Presbytery were summoned to the bar of the Court of Session, where they appeared in June last, accompanied by some of the leading clergymen in Edinburgh. They were solemnly reprimanded, and were told that they had violated the laws of their country, that they would in this instance be dealt with leniently, but that if they or any other clergymen should hereafter commit a similar offence, they would be committed to prison. Mr. Kessen is at this moment fulfilling the duties of pastor of Lethendy, with no dependance but on the voluntary offerings of the people who are attached to him; and it is optional at any time with Mr. Clark to move the court to put him in possession of his legal rights.

The most serious case of all has occurred, at least has come to a crisis, within the last fortnight. I allude to the Marnoch case. Marnoch is a parish in Aberdeenshire, in the Presbytery of Strathbogie, containing a population of 3000 persons. A Mr. Edwards was appointed to the living, who is said to be so unpopular, that when the Presbytery met "to moderate on the call," as it is termed, only a single parishioner, out of 3000, could be found to give his voice in his favour. Out of 300 male heads of families, being communicants, 260 protested publicly against the presentation. After the rejection of Mr. Edwards, the patron presented another individual, towards whose settlement certain steps were taken. The Court of Session, on the application of Mr. Edwards, pronounced a decree against the legality of the second appointment. The Presbytery having to choose between disobeying the judges of the land and disobeying the veto law of the church, determined to obey the civil courts, and to disobey the ecclesiastical. The commission of the General Assembly (which is in fact the General Assembly itself, kept alive from May to May under the character of a committee of

the whole house) being specially summoned to Edinburgh, resolved, on the motion of Mr. Candlish, supported by Dr. Chalmers, to punish the clerical majority of the disobedient Presbytery by suspending them from their pastoral charges! A committee was appointed to intimate this judgment to the clergymen, and to make provision for the discharge of their parochial duties by other persons to be substituted in their place. The seven clergymen, aware of the approaching storm, put themselves under the protection of the Civil Court, by whom an "interlocutor" was pronounced on the 20th of December, interdicting the individuals authorised to that effect by the General Assembly, or any persons appointed by them, from preaching in or obtruding into the churches, churchyards, or school-houses in the parishes of the complainers, from promulgating the sentence of the General Assembly, or from using the church bells in any of the said parishes. It appears that on Sunday the 22d, the whole of the clergymen in possession refused to surrender their churches, but that the parties deputed by the Assembly made their appearance, and preached and read the sentence of the commission in the open air. As the courts are not sitting at present, it is not as yet known what course will be pursued by the judges in vindication of their authority.

Within the last few days a case has arisen at Daviot, in the presbytery of Inverness, where a presentee anticipating the opposition of a majority of the communicants, obtained an interdict of the civil court, forbidding them to exercise the right which the kirk has bestowed on them, of vetoing the appointment. The Presbytery met to moderate on the call, when the communicants put in a petition, stating that they were under coercion by an extra-ecclesiastical power, and praying the Presbytery to defer proceeding in the settlement until they had liberty to avail themselves of their rights. The Presbytery, by a majority, has acceded to the petition, and postponed further proceedings until after the next meeting of the General Assembly in May, 1840.

These circumstances are sufficiently indicative of an approaching crisis in the collision between the Church and the State. But in the midst of these proceedings there has just appeared one of the most important publications that the country has yet seen on the subject. I allude to Dr. Chalmers's "*Remarks on the present Position of the Kirk of Scotland.*" I shall not attempt to do more than direct your readers' attention to the book, which will well reward a perusal, as it will give them a thorough insight into the actual position of ecclesiastical affairs, and the enthusiastic feeling of the great party now in the ascendant, of which Dr. Chalmers is the leader. Be it remembered that the writer is Dr. Chalmers, who came up to London from Scotland at the request of a large party of advocates of the Establishment in 1838, to deliver Lectures in favour of National Churches. His sentiments on that occasion have been adopted by the Evangelical party in the Church of England as their own. By their approbation of his lectures, and by the subsequent comments of the newspapers and magazines representing their opinions, they have identified themselves with the eminent and honoured lecturer. Hear,

now,  
most  
pres

"  
of th  
than  
gives  
a co  
force  
of th  
the c  
soul.  
—so  
cond  
pros  
in he  
imm  
she  
lines  
disju  
thos  
this  
citiz  
ethe  
by t  
thei  
sole  
from  
mor  
inde  
in th  
let i  
tion

N  
prin  
cont  
poli  
Cha  
term  
by a  
REL  
pres  
BLIS  
than  
not  
Dr.  
volv  
shri  
rec  
emi  
the

now, his deliberate opinion upon the principles laid down by the most eminent lawyers upon the sister questions of the rejection of presentees, and the rejection of communicants.

“He (the Dean of Faculty, the leader of the Scotch Bar) tells us of the right of church membership, which is neither more nor less than a right of admission to the sacraments; and which right, he gives us to understand, may be prosecuted by any of the citizens at a court of law—so that, if armed with their authority, he could force his way to the communion table, even though by the judgment of the church and of all its consistories, he should thereby profane the ordinance, and bring damage and condemnation upon his own soul. Ere he can forfeit the privilege, there must be a *corpus delicti*—some specific delinquency, palpable enough for cognizance and condemnation by a bench of secular judges, at whose mandate the prostrate church must receive into her inmost sanctuary men who, in her own judgment, though living without any gross or definable immorality, are yet living without God in the world. In vain would she lift her reclaiming voice, by telling of a morality without godliness—of the virtues of society, which may exist in a state of utter disjunction from the virtues of sacredness—of the difference between those earthly moralities which accomplish and adorn the citizen of this world, and those saintly graces which alone qualify for the citizenship of heaven. Such things are vastly too shadowy and ethereal for the vision of this world’s tribunals—yet at their bidding, by the doctrine of the Dean of Faculty, we must receive not only *their* ministers into our pulpits, but *their* communicants into our solemn festivals. If this be state religion, the sooner it is banished from our land the better for the good of the church, and for the moral well-being as well as peace of the commonwealth. If such be indeed the necessary consequences of an ecclesiastical establishment, in the name of all that is sacred, let our establishments perish; but let it never be forgotten that the authors of this their fearful degradation—that they and they alone are responsible for their overthrow.”

Now I venture to affirm, without fear of contradiction, that the principles of law which Dr. Chalmers thus forcibly states to be contrary to the principles of the gospel, are part and parcel of the politico-ecclesiastical system, both of England and of Scotland. Dr. Chalmers has thus (*if this legal opinion be correct*) declared, in terms, at least, equalling in strength those which have been employed by any advocate of the voluntary principle, that “THE SOONER STATE RELIGION IS BANISHED FROM OUR LAND THE BETTER,” and has expressed a desire that “IN THE NAME OF ALL THAT IS SACRED ESTABLISHMENTS MAY PERISH.” And this is the same person who less than two years ago, lectured in favour of Establishments. Who does not honour him for the manliness of his avowal? No one who knew Dr. Chalmers ever doubted, that whatever consequences were involved in a straightforward declaration of opinion, he would ever shrink from making it, whether it told for or against his previously recorded conclusions. But who, after this manifesto, from such an eminent friend of the Kirk of Scotland, will hesitate to investigate the general question of Establishments? Dr. Chalmers elsewhere

says (page 110—address to the Bishops and Clergy of England) that if a blow is struck at the spiritual independence of the church, “THE TIME CANNOT BE FAR DISTANT WHEN THE CAUSE OF RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENTS SHALL BE ABANDONED, AS HAVING A TAINT AND LEPROSY OF EVIL ESSENTIALLY AND INCURABLY ADHERING TO THEM.”

The Kirk of Scotland will endeavour, early in the approaching Session, to obtain a change in the law of the land, sanctioning the veto. I shall, in another letter, give my reasons for believing such an attempt to be as hopeless as the success of it would be fatal to the liberties of the country. In the meantime I trust that many of your readers will make it a subject of serious prayer, that the approaching crisis in the general question of Establishments may be met by all parties in a right spirit; that we may all be willing to hear what others have to say; and that God may incline the hearts of His people, of all denominations, to try the soundness of their opinions by the only infallible test of truth, His Revealed Word.

I am, Sir, your faithful servant,

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH.

*Bedwell Park, Jan. 1, 1840.*

## FRAGMENTS OF PURITAN HISTORY.

### No. II.

THE principles of nonconformity, which had prevailed in the reign of King Edward, were revived and greatly extended in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The blood-stained cruelties of Mary could not destroy human thought and sacred principle, and the fires of Smithfield enkindled that flame which no power on earth could extinguish. But that which gave the most powerful impulse to better principles was the numerous English exiles scattered among the reformed churches, who, associating with foreign Protestants, were induced to examine, with becoming attention, the grand principles of the Reformation; and they did not forget those principles when, on the accession of Elizabeth, they returned home, but endeavoured, as the times would allow, to obtain a purer reformation of the church.

Among the learned exiles was Dr. Thomas Sampson, who had been ordained by Cranmer and Ridley, and who was Dean of Chichester, and accounted one of the most famous and useful preachers in the reign of Edward. He not only assisted Mr. Fox in obtaining materials for his “Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs,” but also united with his fellow-exiles in publishing the Geneva translation of the Bible. While abroad, he formed an acquaintance with Peter Martyr and other continental reformers; and, on Elizabeth’s accession, when returning to England, he received information that a bishopric was intended for him. This intelligence involved his mind in some perplexity, and he addressed a letter to Martyr, requesting his opinion, whether it was lawful to swear “that the queen was supreme head of the church under Christ.” He considered that

Jesu  
no a  
like  
Engl  
and  
differ  
the p  
also  
that  
God  
the g  
churc  
passe  
July  
“  
sides  
occur  
offer  
agre  
pure  
mak  
in re  
of th  
befor  
ment  
also  
wise  
than  
stroy  
of th  
the a  
of M  
God  
for v  
“  
man  
ping  
God  
that  
Und  
by a  
out.  
had  
thin  
as m  
and  
in l  
decr  
but

Jesus Christ was the *only* supreme head of the church, and that no account of any inferior head could be found in Scripture. He likewise signified, that the want of discipline in the Church of England rendered it impossible for a bishop to perform his duty; and that the method of electing bishops appeared to him widely different from the primitive institution, no consent of the clergy or the people being asked. The superstitious dress of bishops seemed also to him very unbecoming. He wrote to his learned friend, not that he expected a bishopric would be offered him: he prayed to God that it might not. He resolved to apply himself to preaching the gospel, and to avoid having any share in the government of the church, till he saw a thorough reformation promoted.\* Many letters passed between them; and Martyr, in his first communication, dated July 15, 1559, addressed him as follows:

"My good friend. I see in your letters you are afraid on both sides. For, if you reject the ministry, you seem to break off an occasion of well-doing; but, if you take upon you the function offered, you justly, and for good cause, fear lest you should seem to agree to those ordinances, which not only diminish and deface the pure worshipping of God, but also corrupt it, and marvellously make it to decay. Howbeit, a man who is somewhat better instructed in religion, seeing you, a messenger of Christ and an earnest preacher of the gospel, to be apparelled with garments at the altar, to pray before the crucifix, to recite holy words, and to distribute the sacraments, will he not think that these rites are not only suffered, but also allowed by you? Whereupon, afterward, when you teach otherwise, he will not give credit unto you. He who teaches otherwise than he doeth, buildeth those things which he destroyeth, and destroyeth those things which he buildeth. Neither can the example of the Apostle be coloured by such a fact, who, for a time, retain the Jewish ceremonies with a safe conscience. For the ordinances of Moses were in old time brought in by the authority and law of God, not found out by man's counsel, neither were they condemned for worshipping's sake.

"These things of which we now speak, were both instituted by man, without any divine oracle, and gorgeously served the worshipping which at this day so many as be godly do detest. Would to God they who judged that things ought to be kept, had perceived that the gospel is not firm enough so long as these things remain. Undoubtedly, if we would hate superstitions from the heart, we would by all means provide that the very steps of them might be rooted out. Would to God that the perverse endeavour of our adversaries had made us somewhat better learned. They diligently shun all things whatsoever which savour of our religion, and, of set purpose as much as they can, depart from the plain worshipping of Christ, and from the most ancient custom of the Apostles. Why do not we, in like manner, provide to be most far off from their pernicious decrees, and to follow the apostolic simplicity, not only in doctrine, but also in administration of the sacraments? I cannot see how

\* Burnet, vol. iii. p. 292.

these things can rightly be judged things indifferent. Certainly to beholders they represent an express show of the pestiferous mass, whereby ungodly men exceedingly delight themselves.

"Wherefore, my most dear brother in Christ, seeing things stand in this state, I advise you two things: first, that you retain still the function of preaching, and cease not publicly and privately to defend the truth of doctrine, and to abolish the rites which be full of offence and occasions of falling. Secondly, that you for a while abstain from the ministry of the sacraments, until those intolerable blemishes be taken away. By this means shall not be lost the occasion of well-doing, neither shall you by your example confirm others in superstitions. And this is not my counsel alone, but the same is also the opinion of the reverend Mr. Bullinger."\*

Martyr, in another epistle, dated the 4th of November, this year, further observes:—"Of garments, as of holy things to be used in the ministry, seeing they represent the form of the mass, and be mere relics of Popery, Mr. Bullinger judgeth that they should not be used, lest by your example the things which cause offence should be confirmed. I have been always against such kind of ornaments; because I saw a present danger lest you should be deprived from the office of preaching, and that perhaps there will be some hope that even as altars and images are taken away, so likewise shall be taken away those shows of the mass, if you and others coming to be bishops will wholly apply your endeavours thereunto; which perhaps would not go forward, if any other should succeed in your place, who not only would not care to put away those relics, but would rather defend them, nourish them, and maintain them. I was the slower to persuade, that you should rather refuse a bishopric, than receive the use of those garments. I saw that offences of that kind must be utterly avoided, therefore did I willingly yield to this opinion. Verily, where altars and images are preserved, I affirm, even as I have written in other letters, that ye must not minister. Look you to this, that you do not any thing against your conscience. When I was at Oxford," in the reign of King Edward, "I would never use those white garments in the quire, although I was canon. I saw a reason for my doing; therefore, I counsel you to take good advice. I know that my example ought to be no just confirmation unto you; but that which moved me, and perhaps may move you, is, that I should not do those things which my conscience alloweth not."†

Dr. Sampson, having received Martyr's answer, replied by returning the following information:—"We are under sad apprehensions, concerning which we desire an interest in your prayers. We are afraid lest the truth of religion, in England, should either be overturned or very much darkened. Things stick with me. I can have neither ingress nor egress. Let others be bishops: I desire only to be a preacher, and no bishop. There is yet a general prohibition of preaching; and still a crucifix on the altar at court, with lights burning before it. Though, by the queen's order, images are re-

\* Martyr's Letters, p. 121.

† Martyr's Letters, p. 122.

re-  
re-  
ra.  
be  
an  
ly  
on  
hts  
re-

1840.

move  
joice  
offici  
as su  
ment  
freed  
he a  
of th  
the c  
than

T  
Sam  
grea  
wer  
occl  
they  
his  
mat  
ata  
chu  
not  
and  
reli  
Bu  
tion

rel  
me  
im  
for  
gr  
Th  
by  
ec  
da  
cu

m  
g  
P  
o  
s  
in  
v  
v  
h

moved out of the churches all over the kingdom; yet the people rejoice to see that this is still kept in the queen's chapel. Three bishops officiate at the altar: one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as sub-deacon, all in rich copes before the idol; and there is sacrament without sermon. Injunctions are sent to preachers not to use freedom in reproving vice!" Having furnished this information, he asks Martyr, Bullinger, and Bernardin, what was their opinion of these things; and whether, if similar injunctions were sent to all the churches, the clergy ought to obey, or suffer deprivation rather than comply?\*

To this letter the venerable Martyr replied, earnestly pressing Sampson not to decline the offered promotion, since there was so great a want of ministers; and that if he and his brethren, who were considered as "the pillars of the Reformation," should refuse ecclesiastical offices, the churches would be destitute of pastors, and they would give place to "wolves and antichrists." He expressed his deep regret at the manifest interruptions to the work of reformation, wishing that all things might be reduced to the apostolic standard: adding—"If you sit in the place of government of the church, there is a hope that you may amend many things, although not all. This, I say, that all superstition must in anywise be avoided; and you must travail all that you can to have them rid away, as the relics of the Amorites. Of all this matter, I conferred with Mr. Bullinger, who giveth his consent, and sendeth you hearty salutations."†

Dr. Sampson stated the pungent grief which he felt at the popish relics and superstitions retained in the English church, and recommended his learned friend to address the queen on this painful but important subject, as the most likely means of obtaining a better reformation; to which Martyr thus replied: "Those things which grieve you, and such as you, do also grieve me and my brethren. That which you fear, we cannot turn away from you, otherwise than by our prayers, which, believe me, we carefully do and will do. As concerning writing to the queen about this matter, this you will understand, that I am so overcharged with business, as though I have ever so much a mind to do it, yet I cannot."‡

Dr. Sampson was classed among other "spiritual men," who had no ecclesiastical promotion; yet he was a divine eminently distinguished for zeal, piety, and learning. He could not sacrifice his principles for the sake of lucrative preferment. He cheerfully obeyed whatsoever was required in the word of God; but no consideration on earth could induce him to observe popish superstitions in divine worship, at which his judgment and his conscience revolted. He could not enter the episcopal office while encumbered with so many Romish relics; he therefore declined the bishopric when offered him. This he communicated to Martyr, and requested him not to censure him till made acquainted with his reasons.§

\* Burnet, vol. iii. p. 292.

† Martyr's Letters, pp. 122, 123.

‡ Ibid. p. 124.

§ Burnet, vol. iii. p. 292.

He was afterwards elected Dean of Christchurch, Oxford; and it "might be questioned whether there was a better man, one more skilled in variety of languages, or more excellent for his erudition, or a more able divine."<sup>a</sup> Notwithstanding these eminent qualifications, he endured long and severe persecution for his honest and unyielding adherence to those principles which appeared to him in accordance with the word of God.

In connexion with the foregoing statements, it will be proper to add, that the reformers, who had been exiles in the reign of Queen Mary, held frequent correspondence with the learned Bullinger, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth. Great numbers of their letters were preserved; some of which contained an account of the Reformation in this country, and detailed the compulsory enforcement of conformity to the priestly habits. Bishop Burnet, when at Zurich, examined these original documents, and from which he has given the following information:—"That the English bishops preserved the ancient habits rather in compliance with the queen's inclination than out of any liking they had of them; and so far were they from liking them, that they plainly expressed their *dislike* of them!" Bishop Jewel, in a letter dated May 22, 1559, observed, "that the queen refused to be called 'head of the church,' adding, that the title could not justly be given to any mortal, it being due only to Christ; and that such titles had been so much abused by antichrist, that they ought not to be any longer continued." Jewel, in another letter, dated February 8, 1566, expresses his ardent "wishes that the vestments, together with all other remnants of Popery, might be thrown both out of the churches and out of the minds of the people, and laments the queen's fixedness to retain them; so that she would suffer no change to be made!" Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, in January the same year, wrote to the same purpose, adding, "that disputes are now on foot concerning popish vestments, whether they should be used or not; but God will put an end to those things." Horne, Bishop of Winchester, went further; and, in his letter dated July 16, 1565, "he writes of the Act concerning the habits, with great regret, and expresses some hopes that it might be repealed the next session of parliament, if the popish party did not hinder it; and he seems to stand in doubt whether he should conform himself to it or not; upon which he desires Bullinger's advice." Cox, Bishop of Ely, in one of his letters, "laments the aversion that they found in the parliament to all the propositions that were made for the reformation of abuses." Our author adds, "in many of these letters it is asserted, that both Cranmer and Ridley had intended to procure an act for abolishing the habits, and that they only defended their lawfulness, but not their fitness, and therefore they blamed private persons who refused to obey the laws." Grindal, Bishop of London, in a letter dated August 27, 1566, says, "That all the bishops who had been beyond sea, had, at their return, dealt with the queen to let the matter of the habits fall; but she was so

<sup>a</sup> Lansdowne's MSS. vol. vii. No. 2.

prepossessed, that though they all had endeavoured to divert her from prosecuting that matter, she still continued inflexible. This had made them resolve to submit to the laws, and to wait for a fit opportunity to reverse them. He laments the ill effects of the opposition that some had made to them, which had extremely irritated the queen's spirit, so that she was become much more heated in those matters than formerly.\*

Burnet stated these facts to show what were the sentiments of the "chief churchmen" concerning the Reformation. Bishop Sandys, addressing Peter Martyr, said that though the popish vestments were still used, he hoped they would be soon taken away; and that they were retained on "pretence of unity," but "occasioned the greatest divisions." And we are informed that he was so vehemently opposed to retaining popish impurities in our reformed church, that he was in danger of losing the queen's favour, and of being deprived of his bishopric. Bishop Jewel expressed to Martyr his anxious wishes, "that all the remnants of former errors, with all the rubbish, and even the dust remaining, might be taken away."† We may also observe, that when Grindal was nominated to the see of London, he remained some time under "scruples of conscience" concerning the habits and ceremonies required of bishops; on which it was Bullinger's opinion, that, "since they carried the appearance of the mass, and were merely remainders of Popery," Grindal ought to refuse them, lest his example should be scandalous to others. It is further added, that the reformers of those times generally maintained, "that, in order to free the church of Christ from the errors and corruptions of Rome, every usage and custom practised by that apostate and idolatrous church ought to be abolished; that all their ceremonies and circumstances ought to be clearly abrogated; and that the service of God ought to be simple, apart from all that pomp and appearance formerly used, esteeming all that to be no better than superstitious and antichristian." This, our author adds, was the "commonly received opinion" of the reformers.‡

These accumulated facts, Mr. Editor, require no comment; only the reader will naturally inquire, what becomes of the fulsome and disgusting statements of modern churchmen; who, in contradiction of these high authorities, are continually applauding the opinions of the reformers, and the consummate perfection of their reformed church?

B. B.

\* Burnet's Letters, pp. 51—53.

† Burnet's Hist. vol. iii. pp. 291, 294.—Biog. Brit. vol. v. p. 3593.

‡ Strype's Grindal, pp. 28, 29.

## THE SERPENT AND EVE.

How much soever it may shock old prejudices, yet, on a sober examination of this subject, I am led boldly to conclude, that the idea of a literal serpent, or Satan entered into a serpent, as his instrument, in the affair of the fall, has no authority in the Scripture narrative. The Jewish commentators and the fathers were fond of marvels, and they often let their fancies triumph over their judgments, and these have too often been our guides. Does it seem likely that Eve should be tempted by the meanest of reptiles? And, though our fancies may dignify it, by decorating it with beauteous colours, and giving it legs in its primeval state, or even wings; does it still seem likely that a snake should be the organ for effecting the moral ruin of the whole world? I blush for the honour of revelation, when I see the shifts to which critics and expositors have been obliged to have recourse, in order to adapt the passage to the hack-nied view of this subject.\* Even Bishop Horsley, whose great mind rose above the grovelling ideas which others had suffered to prevail over them, considers that Satan tempted Eve *in the serpent form*, and that in consequence, the name of the old serpent has ever since been given to him. Now, why should we study to wrap this matter up in greater mystery than that in which the entrance of sin into the world is of itself sufficiently involved? It appears to me that the historian here relates, as in the rest of his pages, *a simple matter of fact*, clothed in language involving in itself neither allegory nor mystery. It is a fact that "sin entered into the world, and death by sin." It is a fact that "*the serpent beguiled Eve*," and this is the way in which sin entered. THIS SERPENT WAS THE GREAT ENEMY OF MANKIND—the arch-adversary, known in Scripture by various names—*Satan*, as being an accuser—*Apollyon*, as a destroyer—and, THE OLD SERPENT, as an *artful, subtle being*. Moses speaks of him in the latter character, and there is no more reason to suppose that he entered into a serpent, or that he even assumed *the form* of a serpent, to accomplish his temptation, than that he should appear in legal robes as an accuser, or clad in the armour of a warrior, as a

\* Among other bungling efforts to account for this being a real serpent, the following is quoted in Storr and Platt's Biblical Theology; it is taken from the Comment de Protevangelio. "The natural serpent ate of the forbidden fruit, and Eve observed it. The devil accordingly took occasion to connect with this circumstance a conversation with Eve, in order to induce her to transgress the command of God. Eve believed it was the natural serpent that spake to her, and supposed that the eating of that fruit had conferred on the serpent the power of rational conversation, which she had hitherto not observed in any of the animals around her, not even in the serpent itself, which she had known before. According to this view, the first verse of chap. iii. would be translated thus: The natural serpent became (as it seemed to Eve) more subtle than any other animal."—Storr and Platt, Ward's ed. p. 146. There is some ingenuity in this method of stating the subject, although it amounts at last to a bungling conclusion; for it is easy to see that when Eve says, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat," she but gives the devil himself his own proper name, which she now too well knew; nay, she might have been the author of that name, which he has ever since been doomed to bear, "*The Serpent*."

destr  
scribe  
a ser  
that  
featu  
stroy  
and s  
from  
fore  
as H  
of th  
to m  
subtl  
shall  
prob  
does  
some  
than  
with  
Eve  
own  
form  
the  
I di  
who  
scrib  
knew  
But  
"A  
this  
fiel  
day  
ther  
and  
has  
add  
anim  
be  
ente  
mer  
by  
The  
was  
sho  
ciou  
an  
one  
call  
tha

destroyer. Spirits, as Horsley further remarks, cannot well be described to man but by *figures*, and I conceive that it was not because a serpent was employed in the temptation, as commonly supposed, that Satan was so designated; but from his subtlety as a tempter, a feature as common in his character as that of an accuser or destroyer.\* Take this interpretation, and nothing can be more simple and straightforward than the narrative, while it becomes at once *freed* from all the wild fancies and vast difficulties with which it was before perplexed on every side. "Now the serpent," a certain serpent, as Horsley has it, that is, *Satan*, "was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Cunning is common to many creatures, but this arch-fiend exceeded all in his profound subtlety. "And he said unto the woman, yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Here it seems most probable, that if the enemy did not act *by suggestion*, as he usually does, but assumed some sort of form, that form was more likely something resembling an "Angel of light," one far more attractive than that of a reptile, though painted in beautiful colours, and one with which the woman might feel it no difficulty to converse. Hence Eve entered into conversation,—unless the reasoning were all in her own mind,—and the serpent said, by suggestion, or in his angelic form, "Ye shall not surely die." Nor is the argument altered by the woman's statement in verse 13, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat:" for, taking the word נָחָשׁ in the signification of "one who uses serpentine arts," the answer is sufficiently plain, and describes *Satan himself*, whom Eve, by this time, as before hinted, knew too well to her cost. Then comes the sentence on the serpent. But neither does this in the least invalidate this interpretation, v. 14, "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." From this sentence expositors have pictured to themselves the form of an erect serpent, as it existed before the fall, and imagine that now the reptile is not what it at first was. But it has been reasonably remarked, that this sentence is unquestionably addressed to *Satan*, who was to be degraded beneath the meanest animal of the creation. "A reptile," says the same writer, "cannot be supposed thus cursed; for, on the supposition that Satan had entered it, the creature could not be viewed in any sense guilty, or meriting punishment. Satan was exclusively the active agent; and, by consequence, alone responsible for the deed and its consequences." The prophetic words which follow, clearly show that *Satan himself* was the subject of the curse, and describe the future enmity which should subsist between him and the seed of the woman—that precious seed, which, though suffering from his enmity, should at last

\* I am happy, here, in having the aid of *Dr. Boothroyd*, no mean critic, as an authority; he says, "The word נָחָשׁ 'Serpent,' is ambiguous, and may denote one who uses serpentine arts to beguile and deceive. The tempter might be called a serpent, not from assuming the form, but only imitating the subtlety of that creature."

smite him in the seat of life, and gloriously “bruise Satan under his feet.” Satan is then, throughout, *the serpent*, and the serpent which tempted Eve is the same that should bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, but be himself bruised in the head by that seed. Will any one say that the latter was either a serpent in a form literal or assumed?

Thus I hope that, without doing the least violence to the sacred narrative, I have succeeded in rendering clear a portion of Holy Writ which has been needlessly involved in perplexities, chiefly owing to the mistakes of early commentators, who have been implicitly followed where they ought to have been cautiously examined.

J. C.

Camberwell.

---

ON THE PROMISE,—“LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAY, EVEN  
UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD.”—MATT. XXVIII. 20 *end.*

IN the discussion of this text which has lately been conducted with so much ability and good temper in the *Congregational Magazine*, it appears to the author of the following remarks that *the Reviewer of Faber* has firmly established the explanation which he advocates, and that in the way of argument little more remains to be said.

Yet, as the subject is one of great interest and importance, both on its own account, and in reference to the principles of scriptural interpretation which it involves; and, as various commentators of former times, and several learned and pious men of the present day have adopted the opposite opinion, it may not be superfluous to review that portion of the evangelical narrative in which the promise is contained. But, as the materials of this narrative are dispersed through five different books of the New Testament, it cannot be fully appreciated, unless they are arranged and united in a harmonized form. An attempt of this kind is accordingly subjoined.

The method employed, having long since been explained in former volumes of the *Magazine*,\* will not now be particularly described. It may be sufficient to state that the several portions of the sacred narrative are here disposed in what seems to have been the order of occurrence. To each portion is prefixed the name of the book where it is found, with the chapter and verse. When the name is printed in Roman capitals, it implies that the ensuing paragraph is peculiar to that book; when in small Italics, that it is selected from two or more parallel passages, which in that case are collated in separate columns, and in a smaller character. The version is founded on the text of Griesbach; and, whilst in general more free, is in some places, perhaps, rather closer than that in common use. Words added to complete the sense are inclosed within brackets, and a few explanatory notes are inserted at the foot of the page.

\* See the *Congregational Magazine* for the year 1831; Numbers for January, March, April, September, November, &c.

When a clear view of the facts of the case has thus been obtained, some inferences in illustration of the subject, formed on the inductive principle, will afterwards be proposed.

EVANGELICAL NARRATIVE OF THE FINAL CHARGE OF CHRIST TO HIS APOSTLES, AND OF HIS ASCENSION TO HEAVEN.

Matt. xxviii, 18—20 end; Mark, xvi, 15—20 end; Luke, xxiv, 44—53 end; Acts, i. 1—14; 1 Corinth. xv, 7.

1 CORINTH. xv, 7. After this, [Jesus] appeared to James, then to all the apostles;—Acts, i, 3. to whom, also, by many infallible proofs he showed himself alive after suffering [death,] having been seen by them during forty days, and spoken of the things concerning the kingdom of God.

COLLATED NARRATIVES.

MATT. xxviii.	Acts, i.
18—And Jesus came,	4—And, having called [them] together,
	MARK, xvi.
and spake to them,	15—And he said to them,
aying,	

CONSOLIDATED TEXT.

Acts, i. 4—[At last,] having called [them] together,

Matt. xxviii,—18—he spake to them, saying,

MATT. xxviii,—18. Universal authority is given to me in heaven, and on earth:—MARK, xvi,—15. Go forth throughout all the world, preach the gospel to the whole people of Israel,—MATT. xxviii, 19. [and] make disciples [among] all the Gentiles, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, 20—[and] teaching them to observe whatsoever things I have commanded you.—MARK, xvi, 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that refuseth shall be condemned.—MATT. xxviii,—20 end. Behold, I am with you all the [remaining] days, till the end of the age;—MARK, xvi, 17. and these miracles shall attend on those that believe. By my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak languages before unknown [to them,] 18. they shall take up serpents [without being hurt,] and, should they drink poison, it shall not injure them, they shall lay [their] hands on sick persons, and they shall recover.

LUKE, xxiv, 44. He further said to them, These are the words which I spake to you while I was yet with you, that all which is written concerning me in the Law of Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, must be fulfilled. 45. Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures, 46. and said to them, Thus it is written,

ALTERATIONS, OMISSIONS, NOTES, &c.

1 Corinth. xv, 7. After this,—that is, after the appearance of Christ on a mountain in Galilee to more than five hundred brethren at once, including the eleven apostles.—Acts, i,—3—after his suffering.—Matt. xxviii,—18— *πάσα ἡ κτίσις*—all authority.—Mark, xvi,—15, preach the gospel—*πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*—to the whole creation, institution, or peculiar people of God; that is, to the whole people of Israel.—Matt. xxviii, 19—Going forth, make disciples.—*therefore*—expunged by Griesbach.—20. *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*—all the days till the end of the age,—that is, till the end of the Mosaic dispensation.—*Amen*.—expunged by Griesbach.

and thus it was necessary that Christ should suffer [death,] and rise from the dead the third day, 47. and that repentance and discharge of sins should be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. 48. Now, ye are witnesses of these things.

## COLLATED NARRATIVES.

LUKE, xxiv.  
49. And, behold, I send [down] on you the [gift] promised by my Father; but remain in the city till ye are endued with power from above.

ACTS, i.  
—4—he commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to await the [gift] promised by the Father,

## CONSOLIDATED TEXT.

*Luke*, xxiv, 49—And, behold, I send [down] on you the [gift] promised by my Father,—*Acts*, i,—4. of which ye have heard me [speak,]—*Luke*, xxiv,—49. but remain in the city till ye are endued with power from above;

*Acts*, i, 5. for John, indeed, baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with [the] Holy Spirit not many days hence.

*LUKE*, xxiv, 50—Then he led them forth to Bethany.—*Acts*, i, 6. And, as they went together, they asked him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? 7. He said to them, It is not for you to be informed of times and seasons which the Father hath placed under his own authority; 8. but ye shall receive power by the Holy Spirit descending on you, and shall be witnesses to me, both in Jerusalem, and throughout all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the end of the earth.

## COLLATED NARRATIVES.

MARK, xvi.  
10—After [thus] speaking to them, the Lord

ACTS, i.  
9—Having thus spoken,

## CONSOLIDATED TEXT.

*Mark*, xvi, 19—After [thus] speaking to them, the Lord

*LUKE*, xxiv,—50. (\*) lifted up his hands, [and] blessed them; 51—and, while he was blessing them,—*Acts*, i,—9.—[and] they were looking on,

## COLLATED NARRATIVES.

LUKE, xxiv.  
—51. he was separated from them,

ACTS, i.  
—9—he was taken up,

## CONSOLIDATED TEXT.

*Acts*, i,—9,—he was taken up, *Acts*, i,—9. till a cloud concealed him from their sight.

and carried up to heaven.

MARK, xvi.  
—19— was taken up to heaven.

*Luke*, xxiv,—51. And he was carried up to heaven.

## ALTERATIONS, OMISSIONS, NOTES, &amp;c.

*Mark*, xvi,—17. they shall speak with new tongues.—18—and, should they drink any thing poisonous.—*Acts*, i,—4. the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me.—*Luke*, xxiv,—49—the promise of my Father.—remain in the city—*Jerusalem*—expunged by Griesbach.

*Luke*, xxiv, 50. (\*) and.—In this place, Bethany does not mean the town of that name, which was about two miles from Jerusalem; *John*, xi, 18, but the district, the western limit of which, contiguous with that of Bethphage, *Mark*, xi, 1, *Luke*, xix, 29, was rather less than a mile from the city.—*Acts*, i,—12. which is near Jerusalem, having a sabbath-day's journey [interval.]—7—It is not yours to know.—8—the Holy Spirit coming on you.—9. and a cloud withdrew him from their eyes.

MARK, xvi,—19. and sat down at the right hand of God.

ACTS, i, 10. While they were gazing up towards heaven, during his ascension, behold, two men in white clothing stood near them; 11. who said, Galileans, why stand ye looking towards heaven? This Jesus, who hath been taken up from you to heaven, will come [again] in the same manner in which ye saw him go to heaven.—LUKE, xxiv, 52—[On this,] after worshipping him,

## COLLATED NARRATIVES.

LUKE, xxiv.	ACTS, i.
—52—they returned to Jerusalem.	12—Then they returned to Jerusalem.

## CONSOLIDATED TEXT.

Luke, xxiv, — 52—they returned to Jerusalem,

LUKE, xxiv,—52. with great joy,—ACTS, i,—12. from the hill called [the Mount] of Olives, which is no further from Jerusalem than a sabbath day's journey. 13. Having entered [the city,] they ascended to the upper chamber, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James [the son] of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas [the brother] of James. 14. All these with one accord applied [themselves] to prayer, with the women, with Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren;—LUKE, xxiv, 53. *end.* and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God.—MARK, xvi, 20. *end.* [After this,] they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with [them,] and confirming the word by the miracles with which it was attended.

## ALTERATIONS, OMISSIONS, NOTES, &amp;c.

Acts, i,—10—as he went.—14—applied [themselves] to prayer,—and *supplication*,—expunged by Griesbach,—with the women—perhaps—with [their] wives.—Mark, xvi,—20. by the ensuing miracles, —*Amen*.—expunged by Griesbach; as likewise at the end of Luke, xx, 53.

(To be continued.)

London, January, 1840.

W. S.

## REMARKS ON FAITH.

## No. II.

SEVERAL objections, in addition to those stated in my last paper, appear to me to lie against Dr. Payne's notion of the faith that justifies. These I will in the first place state.

To view faith, then, as an act of mere intellect, confounds it, I think, with spiritual illumination, diminishes the importance attached in the Scriptures both to it and unbelief, and would require a great alteration in the current phraseology which has been adopted by all classes of evangelical divines in speaking on the subject.

He admits, p. 277, that an unconverted man may attain a correct knowledge of the doctrines of the gospel, of the Saviour's divinity, incarnation, atonement, intercession, &c. and that, so far as he

understands, he may believe them; but such a man, he says, is not saved either by his knowledge or his faith, because it is not the *gospel* they have for their object. But what is the real difference between this man and another, whose knowledge and faith do save him? Is it not, according to Dr. Payne, that the mind of the one is divinely illuminated, and the mind of the other not? The faith in both cases is precisely the same, and so are the truths believed; but those truths are seen, and consequently believed, by the one in a natural, by the other in a spiritual light. What is this but to say, that the *illumination of the Spirit* is the occasion on which the sinner is justified before God?

But in what way does Dr. Payne view that illumination of the Spirit by which the glory of the gospel is unveiled to the mind? As disclosing any *new truths*? Certainly not. As affording additional evidence to the truths already admitted? But if so, it is not, as we have already observed, evidence of a kind which the understanding can appreciate. I do not think, however, that it is as evidence that he regards it; and if not, I am at a loss to discover its connexion with the kind of faith for which he contends.

The sacred writers represent faith as a divinely produced, an entirely new, an ever active and productive principle. As an intellectual act, however, surely these are not correct descriptions of it. It is not a fruit of the Spirit; nor, so far as I can discern, is there any necessity for an operation of the Spirit in relation to it. But it may be said, that the *disposition* in which it originates, and by which the sinner is led to *direct* his belief to THE GOSPEL, is the production of the Spirit; I reply, that this does not constitute the *exercise of faith itself* such, and I confess that I have been accustomed to regard it as an office of that divine Agent, not only to *exhibit Christ*, but to *inspire faith*, and accordingly to add to the prayer, "lighten my darkness," the further request, "help me to believe."

Again, when I observe the manner in which the sacred writers speak of faith as a *new* principle, as one which had *no previous existence* in the heart, I cannot think it sufficient to say, that it is new as to its *object* merely. Men are reprov'd, not only for the wrong direction of their faith, but for their no belief, and are addressed as destitute both of spiritual light and of the principle of faith itself; both as *not believing* the *true* gospel, and as *not believing any* gospel, as altogether without faith. It is by no means sufficient to say, that where the gospel is not understood, it cannot, as a *matter of course*, be believed. This is true; but the want of faith, as a *matter of course*, does not explain the phraseology of the Scriptures; and this will the more strikingly appear, if we inquire *what is unbelief?* the unbelief especially of the man who *believes the theory of the gospel*. Is it nothing but the *non-direction* of the mind to that gospel in its spiritual meaning? or, which, as far as I can perceive, is nearly the same thing, the want of spiritual perception? Without doubt it supposes this; but is this *all*? Do the *Scriptures* speak of it as this *passive* and *quiescent* thing? Do they not represent it as a powerful and active principle of evil, evil

in itself, as well as in its influence? There are three states of mind, which include all others, on which they chiefly dwell—wilful ignorance of the gospel, enmity against it, and unbelief of it. They speak of the latter not less frequently than of the others, as one of the chief sins; as a primary evil; as eminently prolific of mischief. But if this be unbelief, it is not truly so; it is a secondary evil only. It arises, as a natural consequence, out of a previous state, which first requires correction, and the correction of which may be all that is needed; and to render themselves intelligible, they ought to direct their denunciations against the sinner's blindness and enmity, rather than against his unbelief. But instead of doing so, it is with unbelief that, in the first instance, they charge him; whilst it is faith that, in the first instance, they exhort him to exercise. Our phraseology, too, ought likewise to undergo a thorough change. We mislead the sinner by pressing him to believe. Instead of the expressions, *weak and strong faith*, we should say, *small and large measures of illumination*; and no longer use, as our most importunate request, the prayer, "Lord, increase our faith."

Again, the faith that saves is a productive principle; it works by love, and brings forth the fruits of righteousness and true holiness. So, would Dr. Payne say, does that of which I speak. But if it does, it is a purely arbitrary result; there is no natural connexion between it and its effect; there is nothing in itself to prevent its co-existence in the mind with enmity of the heart to the truth, and the love and practice of sin; and, if it is not seen to exist in such relations, the only reason which prevents it, is to be found in the purpose of God to sanctify every mind that his Spirit enlightens. Now, we are not questioning that purpose; but we do affirm, that God is pleased to carry his purpose into effect by adapted means. And between saving faith and holiness, I apprehend, there is a connexion of cause and effect; there is an aptitude in it to this result; it is a holy act, and its influence is holy; the mind is sanctified by the truth, which the heart believes.

Finally, Dr. Payne appeals, p. 286, to the evidence of every man's consciousness, in proof that faith is an intellectual act. I reply, that my own consciousness, and I am persuaded, after many careful inquiries, the personal consciousness of the great majority of Christians, stands in opposition to his opinion. To offer any argument here is obviously vain. It is John versus James, and James versus John. Suffice it to say, that, admitting the writer's incompetency as a philosopher, his previous history has not been unfavourable to the formation of a just opinion on the subject. It has been his privilege, from infancy, to hear the gospel faithfully preached; he is not aware of having, at any time, entertained a doubt of the truth of any of its doctrines; his views of those doctrines have always been the views held by Dr. Payne; he always admitted the great evil of sin, saw a moral necessity for the atonement, and a surpassing excellence in it; believed he must be born again; and was convinced that the rejection of the gospel must be followed by eternal death. But, up to the age of manhood, he rejected this gospel altogether, as saving and practical, and refused

submission to it. He hopes a change then took place. But, if consciousness is of any authority, his consciousness testifies to as great a change in his *faith* as in his *perception*. He is not aware that he now believes a *single truth* which he did not before *as fully believe* ;\* but when a new element was introduced into his views, and they became spiritual, a new element entered into his faith, and he believed *with the heart* unto righteousness.

Dr. Payne says, that "the practical effect of faith is, in all cases, to be ascribed to the thing believed, not to the act of believing." "In vision," he says, "it is the thing seen, and not the act of seeing, which produces the effect on the mind." p. 291. This analogy he has before employed, p. 286, where he says, that "as the act of seeing is not modified by the object we perceive, so neither is the act of believing." Now I cannot help thinking that the analogy itself has greatly misled him. I admit fully, with him, the great importance of *rightly understanding the gospel*, the absolute necessity of apprehending its true and spiritual meaning: on this point he has not laid *a jot or tittle too much of stress*. But then, as in vision, though it may be the *thing* seen, yet it must be *seen*; so the truth must be *believed*, as well as exhibited aright; and if the act of seeing is not modified by the *object* we perceive, it may be by *disease or injury* of the eye, or by *defect* in the *medium* of vision. The eye does not answer to the object presented to it, but in a certain state, nor does the soul of man to the gospel; it *cannot believe* it: or, to change the figure, it cannot *take hold* of it, it cannot *grasp* it; like the paralyzed hand, it cannot move towards it to seize it. Though the truth should be exhibited in all its moral excellence and glory, the sinner may refuse to believe: he *cannot believe* till *true faith* is *excited* and *called into exercise* by the same Spirit that shone on the sacred page and unveiled its meaning. And it is just as important that the *eye* or *soul* should be in a sound and healthy state, as that the *object* should be exhibited as it is.

The conception of different kinds of faith, Dr. P. ascribes to a desire to account for the different *effects* of faith in different individuals; and when a man's conduct is not regulated by the gospel, he tells us, the conclusion ought not to be, he believes in the *wrong way*, but he believes the *wrong gospel*. I confess, without by any means pledging myself, as the reviewers say, to all that has been written on the subject, or denying that, in a great number of instances, the substitution of another gospel is the cause of ruin; still, I confess myself to have no objection to the old-fashioned doctrine of different kinds of faith. Here is a mathematical problem; I follow the steps of the demonstration; they are satisfactory; I believe it. Here is a book, *De moribus Germanorum*; it is said to be written by Tacitus; I examine the evidence; it is conclusive; I believe it. I am in distress; I have a friend in London; he once succoured me; he is as able now as then; I write to inform him of my condition; he replies, and says, on the first of next month my

\* Taking the term in the sense of an intellectual act merely.

debt  
these  
A  
"Yo  
begg  
belie  
grav  
one  
goes  
That  
duct  
ques  
that  
surel  
alloy  
Th  
ary  
faith  
proc  
is p  
the  
prov  
asce  
mea  
sition  
Sup  
truth  
add  
add  
and  
natu  
imm  
Ron  
char  
rest  
und  
hear  
in a  
law  
the  
rebe  
guar  
prov  
bur  
lenc  
of l  
utte  
vinc  
tion  
cise

debt shall be discharged; I believe it. Is the state of mind in all these cases identical?

Again; here are two drunkards; a friend meets them, and says, "You are both impairing your health, injuring your character, beggaring your family, and destroying your soul. Each *admits it; believes it fully*; has no doubt about it; feels himself sinking to the grave, and sees his children orphans, and his wife a widow. The one dashes from his lips the intoxicating cup for ever; the other goes straightway to repeat his crime. Is there no difference here? That the Apostle James speaks of a faith which is dead and unproductive, and gives no evidence of its vitality by its works, is unquestionable; no expression is to be found which even intimates that it is in its object that it is defective, and the natural inference surely is, that the principle itself is imperfect, or spurious, or alloyed.

The remarks which have been already made, will render unnecessary any lengthened explanation of my own views of the nature of faith. I cannot define it: but let us look for a moment at the process which goes on in the mind of an inquiring sinner, until faith is produced. Now, faith necessarily presupposes the exercise of the understanding: it must have knowledge for its basis. The province of the thinking faculty is to examine the evidences and ascertain the divine authority of the Bible; to investigate the meaning of its statements, and ascertain the relation of its propositions to God, to each other, and to ourselves. But the Great Supreme of whom it testifies, is possessed of moral attributes; the truths it reveals are moral truths; and we, to whom they are addressed, are moral beings; the plan of salvation *especially* is addressed to us *as such*. But as moral beings we are depraved, and so blinded by sin, consequently we cannot discern their spiritual nature. To refer now only to the great truth which stands more immediately connected with justification, as stated by the apostle, Rom. iii. 19—28. Here the agency of the Spirit comes in. He changes not the intellect merely, but the mind and heart, and restores the power of spiritual perception: the blind—blind in their understanding, because evil in their heart—now see, because the heart is renewed; the deaf hear; the dead live. That Spirit places in a holy light before the mind of the man that he regenerates, the law of God which he had broken, and produces conviction of sin;—the infinitely glorious character of the Being against whom he has rebelled, and excites fear, remorse, sorrow, grief; so that his language is, "What must I do to be saved?"—the unspeakably gracious provision which that Being has made to remove the guilt which burdens his spirit, and the destruction which he dreads;—the excellency of the person of Christ, the wonders of his love, the virtue of his obedience unto death, and his power to save, even to the uttermost. But is he *justified* by this? His "*judgment* is convinced;" he clearly "*perceives the harmony and recognizes the relations of the truth.*" But a distinct, a positive, an important exercise is still wanting. "*Be not afraid,*" is the encouraging language

which the trembling sinner seems to hear, "be not afraid, only believe." It is enough. He comes, he looks, he believes; he does not merely *admit* the truth of the propositions before him, and *accredit* the record of God concerning his Son. This is already done. The *soul answers* to it as *saving* truth, not the intellect merely; the *mind* embraces and confides in its promises; the *MAN* accepts, puts on, or to use the appropriate and striking language of the apostle, submits himself to the righteousness of God; the *SINNER*, ready to perish, *returns* to his offended Parent, and, stripped of every other plea, and driven from every other refuge, commits, by a positive act, to which, if I may so speak, power and faculty is a party, both his error and himself to the great and glorious Redeemer, that he may be forgiven, accepted, justified, and saved. This error if I mistake not, is the faith that is attended with justification. Then, and not till then, peace ensues, gratitude springs up, love arises; the sorrow of the heart for sin often becomes more deep and poignant, but the joy attendant on the transition is sometimes unspeakable and full of glory. This faith, which stands connected with a variety of holy and delightful emotions, continues to work especially by love, purifying the heart, and forming the man in the image of Christ.

It would have been satisfactory to have fortified these views by several quotations; I must content myself, however, by referring the reader to a "Discourse of the Nature of Faith," London, 1700, by Mr. N. Taylor; to a "Treatise on precious Faith," by E. Polhill, Esq.; to President Edwards's Works, vol. 8, p. 536.

It only remains for me to show, that the difficulties which press on Dr. Payne's Theory of Faith, and on those which he successfully opposes, do not lie against the views here given.

1. A principal reason of Dr. P.'s preference of the scheme which he has adopted is evidently its supposed simplicity. The different constitution of different minds is truly singular. To me, I confess, it has no charms on this account; and I would rather be inclined to suspect any theory of mental science, whose claims rested on its alleged simplicity. Not that there is not something very beautiful in simplicity; but the passion for it easily blinds the mind, and may lead us to the adoption of views, which are at variance with truth; whilst the idea of faith, as the *consenting, fiducial act* of the guilty but penitent sinner, appears to me even more simple and intelligible, because more natural and obvious, than that contended for by him.

2. The Doctor thinks that the views which he advocates are of great importance, in giving right directions to the inquiring sinner. He says, the tendency of telling a man that he does not believe the gospel *aright*, is to lead him to look to himself; whilst to tell him he does not believe *the gospel*, is to lead him to re-examine that gospel: and to illustrate this statement, he again employs a defective analogy. "As well might a man attempt to invigorate his physical system by watching the process of digestion, instead of taking food." p. 203. True, and I suppose the schools of medicine will soon be closed, and the profession of physic even become a sinecure without pay, as it

is no longer necessary, however deranged may be the functions of digestion, *to get them corrected*; the *right sort of food*, taken morning, noon, and night, will cure even schirrus itself. Again, "In looking at an object, you are not thinking of the *manner of seeing it*, but of the *thing seen*." p. 295. But suppose there happens to be a *fog*, why you wait till the sun shines and dispels it; or suppose it appears *yellow* instead of *white*; *six inches* or *two* in diameter instead of *four*. You ask, "what is the matter with my eyes?" and go to the oculist or optician at once. "We cannot dwell," says Mr. Russell, quoted p. 295, "on thoughts of the *mode* in which we see an object, without forgetting in a measure the *object itself*," &c. Admitted, and who ever dreamt of directing the sinner to inquire into the *mode* of believing? But surely no one will deny the importance of asking, does he *believe at all*; if he does, is his faith that of devils, who believe and tremble; is it the faith of the mere professor, which is holy neither in itself nor in its fruits; or is it the faith which saves the sinner and sanctifies the heart?

When a man, as supposed by Mr. Erskine, p. 295, "who has never questioned the divine authority of the Scriptures, and who can reason well on its doctrines, finds that the state of his mind and the tenor of his life, do not agree with Scripture rule; and concluding that there must be an error somewhere," comes to the minister of the gospel to ask advice; *two things* are obviously necessary: 1st. To ascertain whether it is the *gospel of the Scriptures*, or a *gospel of his own* that he believes; "whether there is not something in the very essentials of christian doctrine, which he has never thoroughly understood." 2ndly. Whether, if he is *right so far*, he truly *believes*; or whether, in consequence of some sin which he retains—some passion he cherishes—some truth his pride resists—some idol of the fancy, the imagination, or the heart, to which he cleaves, his faith is partial and defective. I do *not* mean that he is to go and study the *laws of his mind*; but I do mean, that he must examine its state: I do *not* want him to turn his attention to the *mental process*, or to ascertain the quidmodos and quomodos of its operations; but I insist upon it, that though he have the knowledge of an angel, if he neglect to inquire into the existence, and reality, and integrity of his faith, he may perish for ever.

The Doctor and Mr. Russell have evidently had to do with persons who have mistaken the nature of the gospel, and to whom they have had to explain and reiterate its first doctrines, but in vain; and I know well that the ruin of *myriads* is to be ascribed to the *blindness of their minds*:—but did it never happen to them to meet with a man whose case required such an address as the following:—"Your views, Sir, are accurate, and your knowledge extensive; you have right perceptions of the evil and danger of sin; of your own guilt and condemnation, and of the way of deliverance by faith in the death and mediation of Jesus Christ; your deficiency is *not here*, yet it is *obvious*—in the gospel which you so far believe you do not acquiesce; *no, Sir*, and the reason is this;—*you are joined to idols*; there is a *lust* by which you are enthralled; you are under the *dominion of the world* or the *fear of man*; you are the slave of pride; you therefore *have*

*not submitted, you cannot submit yourself to Christ Jesus the Lord: here lies the defect; the soul, my friend, must surrender itself by an act of faith to him, and his righteousness; or a holy and righteous God cannot blot out your transgressions."*

3. This view of justifying faith is not exposed to the objections urged by Dr. P. against those who err by defect. Is it affected by his strictures on those who err by excess? Let us see. I do not include in faith conviction of sin, fear, remorse, sorrow, contrition, &c.; these are the antecedents or attendants on faith; and *each* has its *proper basis* to rest upon. Nor do I include gratitude, love, hope, joy, &c., these are its concomitants or effects; and have also *their* appropriate exciting causes. If the charge of error in excess therefore lies, it is because I include trust and confidence; and assert that a hearty consent to the gospel, a fiducial surrender of the soul to Christ Jesus the Lord, enters into its very nature. This act, or if you will, these acts, which go to make up the *complex* act of *faith*, but the *simple* act of the *returning sinner* in believing, have likewise a solid foundation. The excellence of the gospel *may* form a part of that foundation; and it does, for I contend that faith is not produced by its evidence merely, as Dr. Payne seems to think; nor even by its *truth apart* from its excellence. The excellence, the suitableness, the efficiency, the divine wisdom and power of the gospel, appeal in the first instance to the mind; they are proper considerations to address to our faith; no man will apply for pardon who does not perceive them; nor can a person be saved by anything which he may call faith, which does not embrace them. The charge of excess, therefore, is set aside. The sacrifice of Christ is a suitable and sufficient offering for sin, and therefore claims the confidence of the rebel; he who presented it is, as a Saviour, mighty to deliver, and willing to pardon; and deserves the entire trust, the unhesitating submission of the sinner to himself; he that exercises that trust, and yields that submission, is justified by his faith, and has peace with God.

Once more, the views here contended for do not interfere with the doctrine of gratuitous justification. That salvation is of *grace*, is a truth of such vital importance, and so fully stated in the Scriptures, that the previous reasonings, whatever force they might seem to possess, if they could be fairly shown to oppose it, must be at once abandoned. An error so pernicious admits of no quarter. But let it be remembered, that the *most dangerous error* lies very *near the most important truth*:—yet the integrity of that truth must not be violated, because the obstinacy of man *may* pervert it. There is so much in Dr. P.'s book, which, in my opinion, amounts to a concession of the point in dispute, that I verily believe if it had not been for the fear of this consequence, he would not have defined faith as he has. This fear seems literally to haunt him, but in the present case, surely without reason. For whilst he fully admits that wherever the faith that justifies exists, there is *acquiescence of heart*—that it is an act of obedience—an act of *voluntary and holy obedience*—nay more, that as an act of obedience *only*, it can become the medium of interest in Christ; he yet labours with all his might to reduce

these  
view  
this  
this  
cann  
The  
oper  
anew  
GRAC  
belie  
of gr  
that  
also  
By w  
miste  
No  
lang  
cise  
merit  
paup  
The p  
sinne  
be ca  
on th  
father  
the gr  
fall at  
ness.  
who v  
any o  
I k  
defect  
additi  
receiv  
redem  
imme  
the ca  
those  
which  
consid  
faith a  
Spirit.  
the id  
resign  
the lav  
by Go  
sinner  
the rev  
pense  
I sh  
tion, 4  
N. 3.

these qualities to the lowest possible degree, that it may not be viewed as justifying by its intrinsic excellence. I cannot sympathize with this alarm. I am not careful so to square my views on this or any other point of christian doctrine, that the deceitful heart cannot turn them into a ground of *presumption* or *licentiousness*. The scriptural view of the case I judge to be this:—"That primary operation of the Spirit of God upon the mind" by which it is created anew, and which is necessary to the *very existence* of faith, is of GRACE: the principle and exercises of faith itself, though it is *we* who believe are the product of the Spirit's power, and must likewise be of grace; whilst the *sole consideration* on account of which those that believe are pardoned and justified, is the *work of Christ*, which also is entirely of grace. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? nay, but by the law of faith. *If men will mistake this they must. I cannot meet them farther.*

Nor is it *necessary*; for I can confidently use Mr. Russell's language, and say, "Faith (*in the sense I attach to it*) is an exercise of mind, to which we never, in common life, attach *any idea of merit*." My friend, who had basely betrayed me, comes as a humbled pauper to my door, asks an alms, and accepts the relief I offer. The prodigal child returns to his father, and says, Father I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thine hired servants; he puts on the robe that is tendered him, and sits down in peace at his father's board. A few of a band of condemned rebels, on hearing the gracious proclamation of their sovereign, approach his throne, fall at his feet, submit themselves unto him, and obtain his forgiveness. There is much more here than *belief* in Dr. P.'s sense. Yet who would ever dream of attaching any idea of merit to the act of any of the parties, although acts of propriety and duty.

I know that these, like all such analogies, may be considered defective; but were they not defective, they would give great additional strength to our argument; for, both on the part of God in receiving the prodigal and justifying the rebel, and in the plan of redemption itself by which his mercy is rendered possible; there is immeasurably more of grace than on the part of the benefactors in the cases supposed, and consequently immeasurably less room for those that receive his mercy to attach any idea of merit to the act which is the occasion of its bestowment: whilst there is this additional consideration to humble the sinner, and keep him from regarding his faith as righteousness, that that faith itself is the inspiration of the Spirit. I cannot therefore think it *wise*, or *safe*, or *needful*, to strip the idea of faith of that *vital* part of it which consists in the *entire resignation of the soul, the sinner, the man*, to Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, and to his vicarious sacrifice as constituted by God, the procuring cause of justification, in order to convince the sinner that pardon and eternal life are bestowed upon him, not as the reward of his faith, but entirely and exclusively as the recompense of the Saviour's work.

I should have been disposed to add a few remarks on the question, "How faith justifies?" but the unreasonable length of this

paper forbids it. I think, with Dr. Wardlaw, that "the connexion between faith and justification arises not from any mere appointment or will that it should be so;" that it is arbitrary no farther than as the original constitution of the human mind was arbitrary; and that, *that* being such as it is, the necessity of faith arises out of the nature of the case.

Dr. Payne's explanation, that "faith justifies by bringing an individual into that body, to every individual of which the blessing of justification is promised," does not appear adequate: what is deficient, however, is suggested by some remarks which occur, pp. 308, 309: "though Jehovah is a sovereign," he says, "he does not abandon the character and relation of moral governor . . . if we are justified solely by the ground of the perfect work of Christ, there is nothing to prevent the justification of all men, without a single thought or act on their part, but the rectoral character and relation of Jehovah." In these remarks I agree; but then they prove nothing, if they do not prove that the act required must be one which shall be suitable on account of its moral fitness;—an act which, "whilst it is one of" entire "subjection to divine authority, cannot be confounded with the fulfilling of the law." I have inserted the word entire; I hope I shall not be misunderstood; I do not mean perfect; I merely mean an act, which is the *real*, sincere, and true subjection of the man to God, in his own way; and perhaps unreserved would be better. Now for this reason I cannot coincide with the Doctor in saying, that *any requisition* would secure the object required by the principles of divine government, or that any act of obedience might have been made the medium of interest in Christ, if it had not been that they might have made it appear as if justification had been by works. In love, *e.g.* there is subjection, there is obedience, doubtless; but it may be partial, imperfect; it is an exercise of the affections, merely, and as such, could not meet what the "rectoral character of God requires." But faith is an exercise, not of intellect, not of will, not of heart alone; it is an act of the soul. It is the sinner, the rebel, invited, coming back to God, and it is the only act which does *thus fully express* his submission. This I imagine may be one reason, at least, of the appointment of faith. And faith thus exercised, whilst it brings pardon and peace to the sinner, through the blood of the cross, glorifies the grace of God, honours him in his rectoral character, exalts his moral government, commends his wisdom and his love, and magnifies his word above all his name. And I cannot help thinking, that if in Dr. Payne's four chapters on the subject, this view were substituted for that which he has advocated, every error against which he is so anxious to guard, whether of Sandeman or Barclay, Mr. Carlile or Dr. Dwight, would be effectually avoided; every important truth would continue impregnable, and all his great points remain intact and secure.

I regret to find myself differing from a man whom I so highly honour as Dr. Payne; I hope that no expression has escaped me, at variance with christian courtesy and love, and should any such appear, I beg him to be assured it has been suffered to remain through inadvertence merely, and not by design.

T.

## REVIEW.

---

### WORKS ON POPERY.

1. *The Variations of Popery.* By Samuel Edgar. 2nd Edition. Revised, corrected, and enlarged. 8vo. London: Seeley and Burnside.
2. *A Text Book of Popery, comprising a brief History of the Council of Trent, and a complete View of Roman Catholic Theology.* By J. M. Cramp. 2nd Edition. Royal 8vo. London: G. Wightman.
3. *The Notes of the Church, as laid down by Cardinal Bellarmine, examined and confuted, in a Series of Tracts, written severally by Archbishop Tenison, &c.* 8vo. London: S. Holdsworth.
4. *Antipopopriestian; or an Attempt to liberate and purify Christianity from Popery, Politikirkhality, and Priest-rule.* By J. Rogers. 12mo. London: Simpkin and Marshall.
5. *The Religion of Protestants a safe way of Salvation.* By William Chillingworth, M.A. 2 vols. 12mo. London: Tract Society.
6. *Popery in England: being the Substance of five Lectures delivered in Little Prescott Street Meeting House, by the Rev. C. Stovel, on the injurious Effects of Popery in England.* 12mo. London: Ward and Co.

WHEN directing the attention of our readers, in a late number,\* to the present condition and prospects of Romanism in our country, we intimated the probability, at no distant period, of again recurring to the papal question, and of pointing out the conduct which we, as dissenters, should pursue, with reference to this stirring controversy of the times. Most gladly could we forego the task. It would be far more congenial to our taste, to take the "big Ha' Bible," "in our house at home," and read,

"How he who lone in Patmos banished,  
Saw in the sun a mighty angel stand,

And heard great Babylon's doom pronounced by Heaven's command."

But as we are convinced that, in the ordination of Providence, the church is the instrument to be employed in effecting the overthrow of all antichristian rule, authority, and power, we dare not, as humble members of it, refuse to do violence to inclination, or flinch from any measure of onerous duty that may be likely to contribute to that consummation. It is not registered to their credit, that Dan abode in his ships, and Ashur in his breaches, and Reuben in his sheepfolds, instead of joining the chivalry of Israel in the struggle with Sisera; and we are unwilling to deserve reproach ourselves by preferring the indulgence of personal ease or literary predilections, to the service which

\* Cong. Mag. Oct. 1839. Statistics of Popery.

the assailed word of God demands. We love peace, but we love truth still more, for peace can never be solid, satisfactory, and permanent, unless based on truth, and frequently truth can only be established by a previous partial sacrifice of peace. In our view, and the subject has been thoughtfully and prayerfully pondered over, this is precisely the position of the church of Christ at the present time. However delightful it would be to be led by the "side of still waters," the circumstances of the times have brought us to the conclusion, that it is not the will of Providence, that this should now, or perhaps speedily, be the church's earthly lot; and firmly are we persuaded, that to rise at once superior to all considerations of fleshly wisdom and carnal policy, and to surrender ourselves at all risks to the simple guidance of truth, is both our duty and interest, as the best and only way to find "quiet habitations and sure resting places." We may have to sojourn for a season in a "waste howling wilderness"—a "land of deserts and of pits,"—where our feet may be blistered with the burning sands, and torn by the scorpion's tooth; but the quickest way to get out of it, is for us steadily and closely to follow the Lord's pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, even when it leads us to confront "Amalek's ungracious progeny." Loving, therefore, as we do, the peaceful ministration of God's word in the sanctuary, pleased as we are to commune with the departed wise and good in the pages they have left behind them, and alluring as it is to shut ourselves up

" In some high lonely tower,  
Where we may oft outwatch the Bear,  
With thrice great Hermes,"

we feel it to be a duty incumbent upon us, to associate with these pursuits an occasional mingling with the strife going on around us, using our best endeavours on the side of "truth, meekness, and righteousness." The body of Moses was deemed worthy of an archangel's care, for Michael battled with Satan in its behalf; and surely the "faith once delivered to the saints," deserves an equal amount of service from all to whom it is in any degree precious.

The volumes at the head of this article afford us an opportunity to carry into effect the intimation to which we have referred. They take us, indeed, over ground which we had not anticipated travelling—they bring before us the "mystery of iniquity" in its length, breadth, depth, and height, from the period of its gestation to its full maturity—but we must be excused investigating so wide a circuit, and shall only allude to the past history and present condition of Popery, for the purpose of showing how we, as Protestants, should now shape our course. Our notices, also, of these books must be brief: a mere table of contents would be tedious, an extended survey would exceed our limits.

The "Variations of Popery," by Mr. Edgar, is a refutation of the claims so confidently put forth by the Romish church to unity, antiquity, and apostolicity. It shows how pontiffs, councils, and doctors have differed from each other; how they differ from the records of inspired truth; how utterly groundless, therefore, is the plea advanced by the abettors of the papacy in its behalf, that apostles watched its cradle, and immutability has marked its character. No desert sands

have ever been more shifting than the sentiments and practices of the Roman communion. Mr. Edgar's aim is to employ against the Papist the weapon which the celebrated Bossuet used against the Protestant in his "Variations of Protestantism." We strongly recommend this volume to the attention of all our readers, and especially to the students in our colleges: it displays extensive research, and is vigorously written: its copious references to authorities render it a useful guide-book to those who may have occasion to engage in the popish controversy.

The "Text Book of Popery," by Mr. Cramp, is an exhibition of the theological system of the Church of Rome, as definitively settled by the Council of Trent. The doctrinal decrees of that council are stated and examined; and as these are received by Romanists of every country as defining the faith of their church, he who wishes for information upon this point, cannot do better than consult this volume. We hope that no one will think lightly of these two works, because we only give them a meagre notice; we find it impossible to quote from them without plunging into discussions which would interfere with the object we have in view.

The "Notes of the Church, as laid down by Cardinal Bellarmine, examined and refuted," is a reprint. It is well known that Bellarmine was recognized by the Romanists of his day as their ablest champion; "we choose him," said Clement VIII. when he gave him the Cardinal's hat, "because the Church of God does not possess his equal in learning." He published in Latin, in four volumes folio, "Disputations or Controversies concerning the Cardinal Points at issue between the Romish and Reformed Churches," in which are his famous "Notes (or Signs) of the Church." The appearance of this work made a mighty stir upon the Continent; and in England one Archbishop, six Bishops, and eight other dignified Ecclesiastics, undertook, in a series of Tracts, a refutation of these formidable Notes. This was published in 1687, and the present reprint, in parts, appears to have been spirited on by an editorial article in the Times newspaper. For ourselves, we should hardly have deemed it worth while to republish these tracts, though they were doubtless useful when Bellarmine was more known and feared than at present. The bench of Bishops may find some things profitable in them; we nonconformists have picked up here and there a pearl; but to guide the opinions of the people of a Protestant country, for whose especial benefit they appear, they are singularly inefficient.

Of "Antipopopriestian," a word which all our lexicographers have hitherto overlooked or been ignorant of, we hardly know what to say. The hidden mystery of this Titanic word is thus laid bare, *anti*, against, *po* for Popery, *po* for Politikirkality, and *Priest-rule*, with the regular termination *ian*; and wonderfully wise, no doubt, after this lucid explanation, will be the men of Saxon speech. Of the writer of this book we know nothing further than that he was intended for the ministry in the national church, was educated at Cambridge with that view, but refrained from taking orders owing to conscientious scruples. He is a scholar every inch of him, a man of dauntless mould, and we should be glad to make ac-

quaintance with him, always providing we may have the free use of our barbarian tongue. We have tried what coaxing will do to make our organs of utterance pronounce Antipopopriestrian and Politikirkality in a graceful and methodical manner, but the words disturb the current of mellifluous sounds. The book is, however, a good one, vigorous, racy, and original, and we warn our readers not to be frightened from its threshold by its name. The chapters on Infallibility, Tradition, and Transubstantiation will amply repay perusal: indeed, if Mr. Rogers will only lay aside his etymological fancies, consult a little the harmless prejudices of the unlearned world, and read men as well as books, he has strength of mind and information enough, to grapple successfully with any Goliath the Philistines may send against the truth. We are anxious for his success as a writer: he displays an honesty of purpose which deserves it, and an ability which, if under the guidance of a little practical wisdom, may command it.

The next book upon our list is the master-work of Chillingworth, which "is justly considered as the most logical and convincing answer that has ever been given to the fallacious sophisms by which Papists still endeavour to defend their oft-defeated opposition to the word of God."

The Committee of the Religious Tract Society have rendered good service to the cause of our common Protestantism by the publication of a very neat edition of this great production. We are happy to be assured in the preface, that "The work is complete: it is *without* alteration or abridgment: the reader has this classic work of English theology in the words of its author." To secure its accuracy various editions have been collated, by which means errors of the press and various readings have been detected, and brief explanatory notes are placed at the foot of the page. These volumes are the most satisfactory reprint that we have ever seen from the Tract Society's press, and we trust that this unanswerable defence of "The Religion of Protestants" will find a place in the library of every Protestant Dissenter.

Mr. Stovel's Lectures are of a more popular character, and discuss those doctrines and institutions of the Romish Church, which have inflicted, in England, the greatest injury on personal godliness, "by dishonouring the Sacred Scriptures—by forging her unwritten oracles—by corrupting the christian sacraments—by degrading the christian ministry, and by the demoralizing policies of Rome." Although brief, yet the Lectures are pointed and powerful, and their publication will, no doubt, extend their usefulness far beyond their gifted author's usual sphere of pastoral labour.

The works now referred to do not form a tithe of those at the present issuing from the press upon the points in dispute between Popery and Protestantism—the Dean of Peterborough, Dr. Turton, and the Principal of the English College at Rome, Dr. Wiseman, are debating the doctrine of the Eucharist—the reformed tenets taught by the Divinity Professor at Oxford, Dr. Hampden, are neutralised in the same university by the Popish writings of the Hebrew Professor, Dr. Pusey, and his colleagues—owing, therefore, to the grave importance of maintaining unimpaired the Protestant faith, and of promoting an enlightened apprehension of it, and conceiving that our principles as

Dissenters are directly interested in the Popish controversy, we venture to offer a few suggestions as to the attitude which our brethren and people should assume. But, in the first instance, we will rapidly glance at the events of the past, and at the aspect of the present in relation to this subject.

It would have been an interesting document, had Luther left us a minute record of his sentiments and feelings when first he crossed the Alps, and became familiar with imperial Rome. Never did Christian pilgrim approach the walls of Jerusalem, or Mohammedan devotee hail from the desert the minarets of Mecca, with a more reverent mind than did the northern monk the gates of the eternal city. In his solitary cell at Wittemberg his imagination had pictured the scenes of Italy as a kind of religious paradise, over which cherubims and the flaming sword of the Almighty kept constant guard. Its capital, as he had sketched it in his reveries, was the Holy of Holies in the great temple of Christendom—its Pope was the chief pastor of Christ's flock on earth, whose eye saw nothing but the sheep of his pasture, whose bowels yearned benevolently for their welfare, and whose hand touched nought beside the pastoral crook—its Cardinals were arrayed in the beauties of holiness, men of sober and mortified lives, familiar with fasting, almsdeeds, and prayer—its churches resounded day and night with the praises of the faithful—its inhabitants were but a little lower than the angels—and every wind that swept over the Pontine marshes caught up an odour of sanctity, and wafted it far and wide, for the refreshment of believers, and the confusion of heretics. But never was any one more out in his calculations than honest Martin. He came, he saw, and returned to his home a wiser but a sadder man, having "looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry!" The grave, austere, and simple-minded German must have felt sorely perplexed and tried when coming into personal contact with the luxurious Leo and his tribe of gorgeously-attired, pleasure-loving Cardinals, he found them in a city, hallowed in his esteem as the scene of Paul's martyrdom and Peter's episcopate, caring little for spiritual duties, and less for decency in their observance; but skilful at dice, toying with women, and lusting for gold. A change then began to come o'er the spirit of his dream as great as that which Mirza experienced when the Elysian fields, which all day long he had been contemplating, and in which he had fancied himself walking, with their myrtle-crowned inhabitants, vanished as the shades of evening gathered, and left him nothing to gaze upon but the oxen, the sheep, and the camels, in the long hollow valley of Bagdad!

It is melancholy to reflect upon the condition of Christendom at this period, for the scenes of sanctified piety in the times of primitive Christianity, the spots to which the Apostles brought the light of truth, and where it shone after their decease bright and unsullied, had not only become "the dark places of the earth," but were as much stained with pollution and crime as overcast with superstition and ignorance. Much as has been written upon this subject, the reading world know not a tithe of the iniquities of the popedom. They only who have left the broad paths of general history, and wended their way into the lanes opened by the chronicles of distinct localities, are

aware of the ambition, avarice, and profligacy of the Romish priesthood, from monk to pontiff, before the thunder of Luther's voice broke upon their ears, and the revival of letters gave tone and strength to popular opinion. The people were tricked and gulled by juggling and foolery, the mention of which calls up a blush on the cheeks of the more enlightened Romanist of modern times; but miracles, legends, relics, the feast of Fools, and the feast of the Ass, on which last occasion the hymn was sung, beginning,

"The Ass, he came from eastern climes,  
Heigh-ho, my Assy;"

these were harmless pleasantries, when compared with the arts practised upon confiding female penitents in the confessional, the agonies inflicted upon the suspected heretic in the dungeons of the monasteries, and the hard bargains struck with rich sinners on their death-beds, to whom the promise was held out of a less fiery place in purgatory, on condition of its being paid for. A forced celibacy too often gave rise to seduction, concubinage, abortion, child-murder, and suicide—the biography of Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, unveils, even in a later age, scenes of unbridled licentiousness in the convents of Tuscany—while, still more frequently, the priest, uncheered and unprotected by the indulgence of the domestic affections, left in his leisure hours to idleness and vacancy, became a gambler, a drunkard, or a buffoon. The spiritual provision offered to the people, consisted of ceremonies engaging the eye and ear, but imposing no discipline upon the heart; the *opus operatum* of the sacraments; and the Latin service, which none of the lower orders, and few of the higher could understand. History has recorded two curious cases of the ignorance of the priests themselves of the language they prayed in; one baptised "in nomine patriæ, filia, et spiritus sancta;" and another, whom Henry II. tricked, when saying mass for his departed ancestors, by erasing from his book the first syllables of the words "famulis et famulabus," by which they became "mulis et mulabus," so that he gravely prayed for the souls of all the he and she mules in Christendom! To live at ease, amassing wealth, and gratifying lust, no matter how iniquitous the means—to maintain an unlimited sway over the consciences of unenlightened and superstitious nations, and consequently an unlimited controul over their fortunes—this was the end aimed at by the papal hierarchy in the half barbarian day of Europe, and for its accomplishment, doctrine was corrupted, discipline perverted, and "lying wonders" invented, while the son of St. Peter assumed the garb of a pontific warrior, wielding the temporal sword, and furbished from the armoury of heaven with the terrors of the world to come. Such was the Romish church in her high palmy days, when she sat as a queen and saw no sorrow, with the seven-hilled city for her throne, a continent for her territory, kings her servants, and their subjects slaves!

That which he had seen with his eyes, and heard with his ears in Rome, made a profound impression upon the mind of Luther, the fruit of which is now seen "after many days." It did not, indeed, at once produce any determinate course of action. He did not see his way clear to become a rebel to the church in which he had been nursed,

and to  
the spi  
been h  
associa  
offered  
he ple  
his re  
man t  
two p  
before  
posse  
and t  
all at  
many  
impat  
The  
joyce  
and  
lucta  
God's  
and  
hum  
crow  
abrie  
bigo  
the  
sisto  
pert  
arra  
to t  
bish  
with  
lan  
pres  
only  
resi  
bish  
info  
mo  
by  
pri  
eat  
dia  
it,  
api  
pro  
Bo  
Lu  
sta  
tin  
di

and to be outlawed by her rulers, until after a long and sore travail of the spirit. To minister at her altars, and to die with her blessing, had been his thought by day, and his dream by night; and the coil of early associations was strong around his heart, and not easily broken. He offered remonstrance with reference to the evils over which he mourned, he pleaded for reform, but Leo slept on his silken couch indifferent to his representations, and then Luther awoke "rejoicing as a strong man to run a race." The particulars of the struggle in which the two parties engaged need not be repeated. No long time elapsed before the Roman see was despoiled of some of its most profitable possessions; Norway, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, North Germany, and the Britannic isles threw off its authority, and successfully resisted all attempts to entangle them again with the yoke of bondage. Even many who remained faithful to the popedom became alive to its errors, impatient of its tyranny, and anxious for a reformation of abuses. The jurisdiction which the occupier of the papal chair had long enjoyed unquestioned, was seen to be the product of carnal ambition, and not an investment received from heaven; and concessions reluctantly granted, but imperatively demanded, have now reduced God's vicar on earth to a shadow, when compared with the Gregories and Innocents of the days of old, before whose feet monarchs paid humblest vassalage, and at whose rebuke they trembled for their crowns. The latter half of the last century witnessed extensive abridgments of the papal authority. In Spain, the most blinded and bigotted of nations under its sway, the pope conceded to the king, by the two concordats of 1753 and 1771, the presentation to all consistorial benefices, he gave up his old rights of disposing of the property of deceased prelates, and the revenues of vacant benefices, while arrangements were made to prevent the introduction of bulls obnoxious to the government. Naples also claimed the right of nominating to bishoprics, and by a concordat in 1791, the pope contented himself with presenting three candidates for the king's choice. In the Netherlands the chapters elect the bishops, a list of candidates being first presented by them to the king for his approval, the pope retaining only a confirming power. Bavaria is more untrammelled, for Pius VII. resigned there for ever the right of naming to the vacant archbishoprics, bishoprics, and deaneries, the prelates being also bound to give the inferior benefices in their patronage only to persons agreeable to the monarch. Austria more completely still threw off the papal shackles, by making the ecclesiastical law to depend upon the civil power, depriving the pope of his ancient privileges, such as collating to benefices, establishing new feasts, exempting convents from jurisdiction, granting dispensations as to marriage, and commuting pious foundations. Let it, however, be remembered, that whatever changes may have transpired in the Romish church as to discipline, its doctrines remain precisely what they were—here there has been no alteration. When Bossuet and Leibnitz were in correspondence about the re-union of the Lutheran and Catholic churches, the Bishop of Meaux distinctly stated, that though in matters of discipline, or any other matter, distinct from faith, the church of Rome would show the utmost indulgence to the Lutherans, on articles of faith, there could be no com-

promise. The doctrinal decrees of the Council of Trent have been received by the whole Catholic world, and these solemnly declare, that whosoever receives not the doctrines of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, tradition, purgatory, penance, justification by works, invocation of the Virgin and the saints, "let him be accursed."

During the five and twenty years of peace which have elapsed since the close of the long continental war, the temporal sovereigns of Europe have been employed in re-establishing their prostrate or trembling thrones, and correcting those democratic principles which the French revolutionary wars introduced into their territories. The same policy has been pursued by the church of Rome with reference to its spiritual authority; and the horror of modern liberalism occasioned by the frightful excesses of its licentious advocates has powerfully favoured the attempt. The emissaries of the congregation, *De Propaganda Fide*, have been stealthily prosecuting this object, working, as usual, under ground, but movements not to be misunderstood, have occasionally brought their plans and views before the world's eye. The archbishops of Cologne and Posen have openly preferred the authority of the pope to that of the king, and in direct contravention of the civil law, have refused to give spiritual legitimacy to mixed marriages. It seems, indeed, to be the special aim of Rome to acquire dominion over the people, by opening a channel of direct communication between them and the papal chair. It is not upon the mighty men and the chief captains that her eye is turned; she knows full well that her power with the kings of the earth is gone; and hence the object now contemplated is to establish a league between the Holy Father and the democracy of this world. For this purpose the services of the Jesuits have been put in requisition; and out to the four quarters of the globe they are gone, to invade our missionary stations, and proselyte the heathen from their old superstitions to the idolatry of the papacy. In home circles, reforms grateful to the popular mind have in various parts been introduced or winked at by the papal authorities. Wessenberg, the Vicar-General of the Diocese of Constance, reads the gospel in the mass in German; and in the church of the Canonesses of St. Andrew, at Warsaw, the mass is said in Polish. Dignified ecclesiastics have assumed the character of reformers, aiming to strengthen the Roman see, by removing those palpable abuses in the administration of discipline and in the manners of the clergy, which were objectionable to the people. In the reformed parts of Germany, long under the influence of mere nominal Christianity, or the cold and comfortless doctrines of Socinianism, or bewildering metaphysics, these Catholic crusading reformers have not laboured in vain.\* The following is the language of one of these

\* The following anecdote is current in Germany. When the Duke and Duchess of Anhalt Cöthen embraced the Romish faith a few years back, the court followed their example, with the exception of one maid of honour, who abided by her protestant principles. Shortly afterwards a young gentleman arrived at Anhalt Cöthen from Vienna, who won the affections of the lady, but informed her that being a Roman Catholic he could not conscientiously ally himself to a heretic. She consented, after a struggle, to forsake Protestantism,

men,  
Rome  
to ab  
people  
"Y

save  
centu  
station  
you.  
the p  
better  
grand  
long  
in mo  
the g  
ancie  
not i  
your  
know  
of the  
so, ev

Th  
tende  
men  
not c  
haile  
far m  
and  
in a  
laugh  
Engl  
prese  
mglo  
main  
be ov

but fi  
he ha  
the q  
when

•  
breth  
judg  
Some  
with  
desig  
mater  
the p  
great  
when  
for t  
with

men, the Abbé Lamennais, which, though it met with a rebuke from Rome, correctly represents the sentiments of a class who have no wish to abjure the Roman communion, but to make it palatable to the people:—

“Your power is dissipating, and with it the faith. Do you wish to save both? Unite both to humanity, such humanity as eighteen centuries of Christianity have produced. Nothing in this world is stationary. You once reigned over kings, and then kings enslaved you. Separate yourselves from monarchs, and extend your hand to the people. They will support you with the strong arm; and what is better, with firm affection. Quit the earthly relics of your ancient ruined grandeur; spurn them from you as unworthy of you. You will not long retain them. For what end do you wear these purple rags, save in mockery of what you were? And what use are they, save to veil the glorious scars which indicate the holy wars, waged by you in ancient times for the human race against their rulers? Your might is not in exterior pomp. It is internal. It consists in the deep sense of your paternal duties, of your civilizing mission, in a devotedness which knows neither fatigue nor limit to exertion. Resume with the spirit of the early pastors of the church, the simple crook, and if it must be so, even the martyr chain. Victory is certain, but at this cost only.”

This is extraordinary language, but what chiefly concerns us, is the tendency to amalgamate with popery, now displayed by influential men in the Church of England—a tendency so apparent that it has not escaped the notice of Romanists at home or abroad, but been hailed with manifest delight in their leading journals.\* Error becomes far more dangerous when its face is masked, and its form is veiled; and Romish delusions must not be allowed to go to and fro among us in a protestant disguise without exposure and rebuke. Some may laugh at the idea of any assault being made upon the protestantism of England; but so pleasing a house of bondage does the papal system present, to those who would have the conscience and heart lulled into magnificent ease, that we cannot regard it with unconcern, whether as maintained at Rome or modified at Oxford. At any rate it must not be owing to our neglect if error prospers for a season.

but fainted when her recantation was made. The lover then informed her that he had paid his addresses to her for the good of her soul, marriage being out of the question, as he was a priest and a Jesuit, a fact of which she was convinced, when taking off a wig which he wore, he showed her the tonsure.

\* “Most sincerely and unaffectedly do we tender our congratulations to our brethren at Oxford, that their eyes have been opened to the evils of private judgment, and the consequent necessity of curbing its multifarious extravagances. Some of the brightest ornaments of their church have advocated a re-union with the church of all times and all lands; and the accomplishment of the design, if we have read aright the ‘signs of the times,’ is fast ripening. Her maternal arms are ever open to receive back repentant children; and as when the prodigal son returned to his father’s house, the fatted calf was killed, and a great feast of joy made, even so will the whole of Christendom rejoice greatly, when so bright a body of learned and pious men as the authors of the ‘Tracts for the Times,’ shall have made the one step necessary to place them again within that sanctuary.”—*Catholic Magazine, March, 1839, p. 175.*

1. As Protestant Dissenters, then, we conceive that we are called upon at this period, prominently to bring forward, through the pulpit and the press, and religiously to respect in our practice, the prophetic office of our Lord. He is the centre and source of truth, its teacher to the church. He has not left it to be preserved and transmitted by oral communication; but to keep it clear from the incrustations with which human weakness or wickedness might deface it, he has permanently recorded its revelation in a volume, which, written by inspiration, bears his image and superscription, as much so as the tables of stone given on the Mount bore the impress of the Almighty's finger. We contend for the supreme authority and all-sufficiency of the written word of truth, against the Rationalist, who would invest with these attributes, the weak, fallible, and erring faculty of human reason. We contend for it against the Papist, who appeals to the opinions of the church declared by its councils as the standard of right and wrong, and thus hides from the gaze of the vulgar the "light of the world," by a veil of earthly testimony as thick as that which concealed the Shechinah from the Jewish laics. We contend for it against the high Anglican churchman, who, though boasting of the reformed name, is still anti-protestant enough to worship at the shrine of antiquity, and to associate the Fathers with scripture as necessary to form the rule and test of truth. The Tridentine Council gave to the Apocrypha the honours of canonicity, and proclaimed unwritten tradition to be of equal authority with the written word; and closely in its wake a large section in the Church of England has followed to the present hour, not only reading in their solemn assemblies the stories of Bel, Tobit, and Susanna, though not more deserving of the distinction than "the tale of Troy divine;" but sprinkling their writings far more plentifully with references to primitive antiquity than to the inspired text. Heylin made the acknowledgment, wrung from him by the Jesuit Knot, that "in the exposition of scripture they were by canon bound to follow the Fathers;"\* and that able controversialist, Dr. Waterland, contended for the junction of the authority of the early church with that of sacred writ, the Fathers with the Apostles, and sought to advance the writings of fallible men to a parity with the words of the Holy Ghost. He declares that "the true interpretation of scripture cannot run counter, in things fundamental, to the judgment of the first and purest ages"—that "to depreciate the value of ecclesiastical antiquity, and to throw contempt on the primitive Fathers, is to wound Christianity through their sides"—that "Christ never sits so secure and easy on his throne, as with these faithful guards about him"—that "scripture and antiquity are what we ought to abide by, in settling points of doctrine"—that, "these two ought always to go together, and to coincide with each other"—and that "when they do so, they stand the firmer in their united strength, but if ever they clash, or appear to clash, then undoubtedly there is an error somewhere, like as when two accountants vary in casting up the same sum."† Here, then, we have antiquity and scripture linked together as necessary and inseparable

\* Life of Laud, p. 238.

† Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, pp. 395, 396, 465.

comp  
they  
mon  
saga  
light  
whic  
in th  
Fath  
divin  
and  
ours  
griev  
cryin  
tong  
Owi  
us g  
the  
othe  
ques  
New  
Cor  
have  
Heb  
and  
their  
taki  
wor  
agre  
How  
Cyr  
who  
kin  
anc  
rule  
tha  
of  
our  
by  
mo  
eig  
he  
did  
the  
wri  
he  
an  
bro  
for  
bo  
to  
wh

companions, and so placed upon the same level, that in a case in which they appear to clash, antiquity has the right to attach *Quod erat demonstrandum* to its decisions, being an accountant equally as wise and sagacious as scripture. These are the sentiments in which Rome delights, and which the theology of Oxford is now disseminating, but which we most indignantly repudiate, not wishing our "faith to stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." We honour the Fathers for their labours, zeal, and sufferings, and admit that a modern divine may derive much assistance from their writings, both in exegesis and hermeneutics; but believing that they were just as liable to err as ourselves, and having evidence in their works that they did err most grievously, we give them a respectful hearing, but must be excused crying out, either in the "speech of Lycaonia," or in our own mother tongue, "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men!" Owing to their proximity to the apostolic age, the Fathers have done us good service in attesting the genuine books of scripture; but this is the only advantage we assign them over the moderns; in almost all other respects they are immeasurably inferior. It may be gravely questioned if some of them had ever seen a complete copy of the New Testament; at least Clement only quotes the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and Chrysostom declares the Acts of the Apostles to have been utterly unknown in his diocese. Irenæus knew nothing of Hebrew, and Augustine was but a novice in Greek; Justin Martyr and Clemens Alexandrinus had far more of the pagan philosopher in their composition, than the christian grammarian or divine; and taking away that venerable garb which time has thrown around these worthies, we should not despair of bringing our Oxford brethren to agree with us, in thinking Doddridge a safer expositor than Origen, Howe a sounder theologian than Cyril, Baxter an abler casuist than Cyprian, and Bates as good a saint as Gregory Thaumaturgus. But whoever the individuals may be, or whatever the authority, whether kings or senates, priests or councils, convocations or conferences, ancients or moderns, that would propose dogmas to our faith, and rules for our observance, we remember that all men are fallible, and that scripture only is inspired—we cannot admit, therefore, the witness of men only where it tallies with the greater witness of God—we bow our own reasonings to his decisions, and we test other men's opinions by his word. This ground we conceive the signs of the times call us more manifestly than ever to occupy; and precisely the same ground, eighteen centuries ago, the Saviour called the Jews to occupy, when he uttered the memorable sentence, "Search the Scriptures." He did not send them to their scribes and rabbins to receive the law from their mouth; he did not counsel them to take their views from the writings of their expositors and priests, the Masorah or the Targums; he did not warn them off from the divine record as something too high and holy for the unanointed vulgar to comprehend and touch; he brought them at once to the sacred page, to search it, and to judge for themselves of the truth; and as enjoying the same privilege and bound by the same law, let us constantly act, searching the Scriptures, to admit what they reveal, to obey what they command, and to reject what they forbid, no matter what array of human authority may be

pleaded for it. All the abominations of the popedom form a practical comment upon the saying, "Lo, they have forsaken the word of the Lord, and what wisdom is there in them?" and warn us against joining in the cry, whether raised at Rome or Oxford, "What is written in the *Fathers*? How readest thou?" The folios of the *Fathers* shall stand upon our shelves, as records of the doctrines, rites, manners, and learning of the ages in which they lived—as witnesses only, not as masters—as declaring what their writers believed, not what we should receive as truth—as testifying what was practised by them in their day, not what should be done by us in ours; to give them juxtaposition with the sacred oracles is to debase the pure gold with an earthly alloy, to invest the judgment of man with an infallibility which it does not and cannot possess, to offer insult to a divine Teacher by attributing imperfection or insufficiency to the revelation he has made, to seek to disrobe him of the Prophet's mantle and to drown his voice with the clamour of this world's Babel!

II. We deem it also of importance, that in our public and private instructions, we should at this time give especial prominence to the showing forth the Lord's death according to the Scriptures, and should carefully magnify him as the "High Priest of our profession." We do not mean to insinuate that there has been any remissness here, but simply to suggest that the opinions floating to and fro call for peculiar attention to this point. He who receives the doctrines stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to say nothing of other portions of the New Testament, must believe that there is actually now no such being as a priest upon earth, that the sacerdotal office expired with the Jewish ecclesiastical polity, that our Lord himself is the only person in existence who has any claim to the title, and that to apply it to any one else is an invasion of his office, and an infraction of his rights. Popery has, however, done its best to nullify the whole tenor of the Epistle, to degrade the sacrifice of the cross by forming out of its earthly symbols a mimic atonement, and to insult the blessed Redeemer of the world by placing man in His priestly station, presenting an offering for the people, and mediating with God. Before the close of the fourth century, the supper of the Lord was perverted by superstition, and spoken of as "a tremendous mystery," "a dreadful solemnity," "terrible to angels," "a mystic table, whose very utensils and sacred coverings were not to be considered like things inanimate and void of sense, to have no sanctity, but to be worshipped with the same majesty as the body and blood of our Lord." So writes St. Jerome; and gradually the doctrine of transubstantiation was moulded, and the eucharistic emblems were regarded as converted into the actual body and blood of Christ, and offered up in the mass by the officiating priest as a true propitiatory sacrifice for sin. This was one of the most profitable speculations, in a worldly sense, upon which corrupt Christianity ever ventured. Those who attended the eucharist in the primitive church had been accustomed to bring oblations of bread, wine, and other necessities for the use of the clergy and the poor, but about the eighth century the custom arose of the richer classes offering money. The temptation was too strong for the officiating priest to resist, and he took the lion's share of it, but as the money went to him, the

laymen who gave it, soon began to consider, that the giver bought, and the priest sold, the mass thus paid for. The more masses, the better chance there was of heaven, was the doctrine of the church, and hence the priests had plenty of clients, for whom they undertook to settle matters with the supreme power, for a fee proportioned to the ability and guilt of their customers. Then came masses for the dead, to shorten the continuance of their souls in purgatory, which at times were so numerous as to be utterly impossible to be said. Llorente mentions a Spanish priest, who acknowledged to having received the money for 11,800 masses he had never performed; and it is upon record, that in one church of the Dominicans at Venice, so late as the year 1743, there was an arrear of 16,400 masses; and in another of the Cistercians an arrear of 14,300. It is mournful to think of such impious outrages upon the atonement of the cross and the priesthood of the Saviour, maintained by fraud, and perpetrated for gain; and, sad to reflect, that to this hour Episcopal Protestantism has retained in her bosom the seeds of this foul cheat, and is now endeavouring to make them bring forth and blossom. The Laudian divines refused to give up the old names of altar and priest, though they had been so monstrously abused. They lingered at the threshold of transubstantiation, and kept the people there, by speaking of the sacramental feast as a religious mystery, and enjoining kneeling as the mode of receiving its elements, the form in which adoration was and is offered to the host. They clung to the blasphemy of the ancient mass, by insisting that the eucharist was essentially an oblation offered to the Deity, an "unbloody sacrifice." There have always been divines of this class among the Anglican clergy. The notion has been kept alive by them, that receiving the sacrament from the hands of a valid administrator is really, *per se*, a partaking of the atonement made by Christ's body and blood; and hence the common occurrence of the dying man thinking no other preparation for his end needful, beyond having the bread and wine handed to him by a duly authorized official. We could not have believed it, had not Dr. Whately, the present Archbishop of Dublin, told us, on the strength of his own personal experience as a parochial minister, that persons are to be found who have a strong faith in the efficacy of the sacramental wine when death is approaching, and who exclaim, "Dear Sir, give me the sacrament first, and then talk to me," when any attempt is made to probe their hearts; that some there are who covet the sacred elements as a charm of sovereign potency against the diseases of children, and who endeavour to smuggle them to their homes to be used for that purpose; nay, he tells us, that some, even above the poorer class, have been known to solicit a portion of the sacrament-money, to have it forged into a ring, as an infallible cure for fits!\* Tell it not at Rome, publish it not in the streets thereof, that after nearly three centuries of Protestantism, these are among its fruits! Errors equally as gross, but far more inexcusable, are disseminated by the Oxford theologians, with reference to the eucharist. They do not say that "bread and wine have vanished at the consecration

\* Whately on the Errors of Romanism.

prayer," but they do affirm that at consecration by the priest, they cease to be mere outward symbols, and become allied, in some inexplicable manner, with the Lord's body. They speak of the elements upon the altar as composing the offering of an "unbloody sacrifice" to God. They are seeking to prove that the atonement is not a doctrine prominently advanced in the New Testament, but is very guardedly and with much reserve, enounced—one step towards the conclusion at which they are evidently aiming, that the atonement is not to be meddled with by vulgar laics, only through the medium of a race of priests, to whom, as "stewards of the mysteries of God," it has been committed to be exhibited by them in the sacramental ceremony, these officials standing between the people and the altar as the channel of communication. When such notions as these are propagated, it behoves us to pay marked attention to the apostolic precept, "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus;" and to oppose to the words of men's wisdom an emphatic appeal to the sacred record—"now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"—"Christ was ONCE offered to bear the sins of many"—"such an High Priest became us . . . who needeth not DAILY to offer up sacrifice . . . for this he did ONCE when he offered up himself"—"ONE sacrifice for sins"—"by ONE offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." We hold the notion of a priesthood, whether in the Church of Rome, or the Church of England, to be one of the subtlest wiles of the devil, ever employed to call off men's attention from the things that make for their peace, one in which he has most craftily consulted the cravings of flesh and blood. Besides being dishonourable to the Redeemer, obscuring the glory of the cross, and bringing a human agent to a co-partnership with him in his mediatorial office—it is destructive to mankind—for if they can have a vicarious religion, be godly by delegation, commit all that is important in the salvation of their souls to the good offices of a deputy, and receive their title-deeds to a heavenly inheritance, by performing some trifling bodily service under his auspices, little will they care for an exercise so troublesome as repentance unto life, a proceeding so vexatious as the circumcision of the heart, or a discipline so stringent as personal holiness unto the Lord. But let our people meet such sentiments as these by recurring to the words of truth and soberness—"I am the WAY, and the truth, and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by ME"—"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?"—"Go ye, and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice"—"Verily, verily, except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

III. We think, too, that among the duties devolving upon us as dissenters in the present day, one of the most pressing and important is the upholding and practical maintenance of the prerogatives of the Saviour as the King of saints. Popery virtually takes the crown from his head, the sceptre from his hand, and transfers these ensigns of his royalty to a hoary old man at Rome, trembling beneath the burden of

years and infirmities. It advances to the throne of the church, a creature of clay, who must "say to corruption, thou art my father, and to the worm, thou art my mother and my sister," and invites us to receive this passing shadow as a being of supreme, substantial power, having dominion over our faith, the keys of hell and of death dangling at his girdle. It commands all people, nations, and languages reverently to hear, and meekly to obey, a man of mortal mould and sinful nature, on pain of being visited in this world with the temporal sword, where he is allowed to hold it in his clutch, and to use it at his will, and of suffering, in the world to come, the vengeance of eternal fire. The Council of Florence defined the Pontiff to have "a primacy over the whole world," to be "the head of the whole church," to whom was "delegated by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern." The catechism of the Tridentine Council declares of him that, "sitting in that chair, in which Peter, the prince of the apostles, sat to the close of life, the Catholic church recognizes in his person the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction, a dignity and jurisdiction not based on synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself: as the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the universal church, the father and governor of all the faithful, of bishops also, and of all other prelates, be their station, rank, or power, what they may." The third canon of the fourth Lateran Council supplies us with a specimen of the application of this assumed power by the Popedom—"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy that exalts itself against the holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, which we have already set forth, condemning all heretics by whatsoever name they may be known . . . such as are condemned are to be delivered over to the existing secular powers, or their officers, to receive due punishment . . . those who have incurred a public suspicion of heresy shall be punished with anathema, and their company shunned by all men, unless they thoroughly clear themselves from the charge . . . secular powers, of all ranks and degrees, are to be warned, induced, and, if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censures, as they desire to be accounted faithful, publicly to swear that they will exert themselves to the utmost, in defence of the faith, and extirpate all heretics, denounced by the church, who shall be found in their territories . . . if any temporal lord, after having been admonished and required by the church, shall neglect to clear his territory of heretical pravity, the metropolitan and the bishops of the province shall unite in excommunicating him; should he remain contumacious a whole year, the fact shall be signified to the supreme Pontiff, who will declare his vassals released from their allegiance from that time, and will bestow his territory on Catholics, to be occupied by them on the condition of exterminating the heretics, and preserving the said territory in the pure faith."\* History tells us that these, and similar enactments, were not suffered to remain a dead letter; and that not in empty parade did the spiritual head of Christendom gird the sword upon his thigh, draw it from its scabbard, and brandish it

\* *Iabb. Concil. tom. xxii.*

before the nations. Looking back upon the annals of the papacy, a multitude of forms pass before us, "red in their apparel," "arrayed in garments rolled in blood," calculated to make us feel like the Temanite who, when troubled by a spectral form in the night vision, declared, "fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake." Some there are amid the throng, "in shape and gesture proudly eminent;" the evil-minded Dominic, who gave birth to the Inquisition, and called into being its familiars, to smell out victims for its tortures; the fiery Montfort, who laid waste the plains of Languedoc, and gave to the sword a hundred thousand Albigenses between the rising and the setting sun; the haughty Guises, planning by day, and dreaming by night, to get the Hugonots within their toils, from which a speedy death was the only possible escape; the bigot Alva, who measured his merits as a soldier by the number of heretic Flemings he had butchered; the morose and gloomy Mary, who lighted Smithfield with the flames which consumed her martyred subjects; these are the ghastly phantoms that appear, assuredly not "spirits of health, but goblins damned," when we call upon the chronicles of the past to show us the progeny that sprung from the alliance of Rome's ecclesiastical polity with the powers of this world. But the Romish church has not been the only one guilty of setting at nought the royal authority of Christ, and committing "fornication with the kings of the earth." This is one of the points at issue between us and the nominally reformed episcopal Church of England. She not only passively submits to earthly lordship in things spiritual, but glories in an unlawful wedlock, with the power of the State. She places the government in causes ecclesiastical upon the shoulders of the temporal monarch, who, though separated from the common crowd by the distinctions of this life, must at last descend to its level, when the brilliant saloons of the castle are exchanged for the dark chilly vaults of the tomb-house at Windsor. She brings forward a son of earth, *terre filius*, and says to all archbishops, bishops, deans, prebends, clerks and laymen, within the realm, "Behold your king," granting to him the conscience as an integral portion of his empire. She keeps up a spiritual tribunal for the correction of all who gainsay her will, and firm concord holds with the secular power, so that the chattels of recusants may be distrained, and the free air of heaven be shut out from them by the walls of a felon's prison. No matter how unenlightened may be the monarch's own mind, hard his heart, and ungodly his life—how tainted with the smell of vice may be the atmosphere of his court, so that modest women are constrained to keep aloof from its precincts; the church embraces him as her chosen spouse, promises to serve and to obey him as a part of conjugal duty, and loses sight of his personal delinquencies in the glories of his official character. We fortify these statements by an appeal to the canons. The first article of the thirty-second, which every clergyman must sign, declares, "That the king's majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal." The royal declaration printed in the Prayer-Book states, "That we are supreme governor of the Church of England, and that if any difference arise

about the external policy, concerning the injunctions, canons, and other constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their convocation is to order and settle them, having *first obtained leave under our broad seal so to do, and we approving* their said ordinances and constitutions." The second canon enacts, "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the king's majesty hath not the same authority, in causes ecclesiastical, that the godly kings had amongst the Jews and christian emperors of the primitive church, or impeach any part of his regal supremacy in the said causes restored to the Crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established, let him be excommunicated, *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of those his wicked errors." The earthly liege-lord, which the Church of England has thus wedded, has not been permitted to slumber quietly by her side. Among the scenes which catch our eye, when gazing back on by-gone time, there is the frequent spectacle of men and women being haled to prison for not foregoing their allegiance to Christ at the command of Protestantism in power. We see a Baxter, standing at the bar, like a common felon, for expounding God's word, and Jeffries fiercely scowling on him for the gross misdeed; a lone woman, with her boy, weeping at the threshold of a jail, that boy afterwards the far-famed Watts, and that woman the wife of his imprisoned father; thousands of Covenanters, roaming shelterless amid the highlands of the north, to escape the sword of Claverhouse, sent to cry "havoc, and let slip the dogs of war." Now, believing as we do, that there is nothing in Scripture to warrant the principle of the church taking to herself a temporal head, that it is a flagrant opposition to the appointment of Christ as "head over all things to the church," and that nothing has been more mischievous to the cause of godliness than the attempt to uphold it by worldly power; we deem it the sacred duty of the dissenting body to bear testimony decidedly and practically against the coalition. Especially is this needed at a time when the oppressive machinery of the ecclesiastical courts is put in motion, to deprive us of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. The employment of carnal weapons on the side of the Establishment, renders it necessary that we should keep our spiritual ones duly polished and attempered. We call to mind, therefore, the sayings of our Master, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great, exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you." "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and ye are all brethren; and call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven." "Be not ye the servants of men;" and making use of all constitutional means, and maintaining an unruffled temper, we would recommend our friends to contend for the truth thus plainly declared, patiently submitting to whatever measure of obloquy or violence may be encountered in so doing.

IV. We would further have the practical and experimental nature of true religion prominently inculcated. Man is naturally a fallen, but not an irreligious being. He comes into the world the child of sin, but not a convert to infidelity. The desire is strong and deep within his heart, upon his own terms, to reconcile himself to the claims of the

Deity; and that system is likely to find favour in his sight, which sanctions the delusive idea of his doing it, without violence being offered to the unhallowed lustings of his nature after forbidden things. Experience proves that men will submit patiently to much onerous external service, and become willing drudges under any burden that may be laid upon their shoulders, if, upon these terms alone, they may satisfy their consciences. The fabrics of ancient Paganism were erected to gratify this propensity; and when they were overthrown, the author of all evil, as one remarks, would have been the "arrantest fool," had he not contrived a scheme to answer the same end. The papal perversion took, in this respect, the place of Paganism, and threw out the tempting bait to mankind, of being religious without being virtuous, and of acquiring the peace of God, while retaining, in its full strength, the plague of their own hearts. Thus Popery has remained to the present; a place of harbourage for the soul anxious to avoid a conflict with its own passions; the modern Babylon, enticing men to its gates with the potent spell, that fellowship with light and darkness, concord with Christ and Belial, may be enjoyed within its walls. For the people, indeed, to be told this in words, would be too gross a delusion to be attempted with success; but such is the doctrine substantially taught, by holding out salvation as dependant upon the observance of outward rites and ceremonies. The Romish church assumes to be Peter's boat floating upon the troubled waters of this world; it declares that, like Noah's ark, out of it there can be no safety, but that in it, there is security from the deluge of the divine wrath, no matter how unsanctified may be the lives of those whom it encloses. The same features are stamped upon the creed of our high-churchmen, the Protestant sympathisers with Popery. They hold it forth as a matter of doubt, whether any out of the episcopal communion can be in a salvable condition, unless they repent and come into their fold. They proclaim the sacraments administered by an episcopally ordained ministry to be the only authorized and ever unfailing means of grace. They call upon their flocks to rejoice in having these conduits of heavenly benediction in their midst, and not to peril their souls by straying off from them among the sectaries, though they may have the sincere milk of God's word to dispense. Far above the "weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," are the sacraments exalted, when received from duly official hands; and thus practically are the people under such teaching, trained up to consider the discipline of the heart as of inferior moment, when compared with "meats, and drinks, and divers washings," under clerical superintendence. It is needless for us to show how utterly subversive of the whole tenor of the New Testament these notions are; neither we, nor our fathers, have ever been in doubt as to whether the gospel is intrinsically a ceremonial dispensation or not; we have learnt, from competent authority, and sure experience, that the "kingdom of God cometh not with observation," being "righteousness, peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost;" but enlightened dissenters must beware of supposing, that, because the spiritual nature of religion is a truth written down clearly enough to them on the inspired page, therefore they can afford to smile upon

the ef  
it into  
"nat  
are fo  
conqu  
offers  
gence  
from  
theret  
conten  
its de  
of ac  
throu  
are u  
W  
our j  
"a  
If co  
from  
strug  
the A  
ment  
supr  
and  
diap  
let u  
favor  
ance  
susp  
have  
suffi  
guar  
ocal  
max  
find  
It w  
aron  
Ma  
to a  
susp  
Gre  
nar  
Act  
may  
like  
to  
ove  
per

the efforts of those who would rob it of its internal empire, and resolve it into a mere physical operation. Let them remember, that the "natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him;" let them reflect upon the ease with which the conquest of human nature may be achieved, by any superstition which offers to pacify its fears, without rigorously retrenching its indulgences; let them think of that immense class of society, who, opposed from thoughtlessness or vice to Christ's yoke upon the heart, are therefore inclined to receive any substitute for it; and let them contend for that prostration of the soul before God under a sense of its demerit, that practical faith in the atonement as the only medium of access to the Father of mercies, and that personal sanctification through the Spirit, without which all knowledge is vain, all observances are useless, and the solemn meeting is iniquity.

We have thus suggested a few topics, which commend themselves to our judgment, as forming, in the language of the Church of England, "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." If coming events cast their shadows before, it seems highly probable, from the aspect of the religious world, that we are on the eve of a struggle, in which it will have to be determined, whether the Fathers or the Apostles, the traditions of men or the counsel of God, the enactments of the Parliament or the sceptre of Christ, shall have the supremacy. The authority of the Bible, the spirituality of religion, and the integrity of our Lord's mediatorial office, are the points in dispute between us and the Roman and Anglican state churches; and let us be prepared to give a public, solemn, and scriptural testimony in favour of these truths, avoiding any feeble compact, or timid alliance with their impugnors, so as to bring our fidelity to them into suspicion. Reproach we may have to suffer, and friendships we may have to resign, but in a righteous cause, obloquy is honour, and suffering renown. We deem it, however, of importance, to be on our guard against an error, which has been committed upon an extensive scale to the detriment of the truth, that of recurring to certain ancient maxims floating in the church, right in themselves, for the purpose of finding repose in them, without being stimulated into activity by them. It will not do while the storm of cunningly devised fables is sweeping around us, to sit by our bright fire-sides, calmly repeating the proverb, *Magna est veritas et prævalebit*. The saying is, indeed, a verity, but to allow it to act as an opiate upon us, lulling our susceptibilities, and suspending our exertions, is not the way to prove it one. What the Greek orator mentioned as essential to effective eloquence, is necessary, on the part of the friends of truth, to secure its triumph, Action! Action! Action! Then, with God's blessing upon their efforts, we may hope, in the words of our great poet, that Truth, though "hewn like the mangled body of Osiris into a thousand pieces, and scattered to the four winds, shall be gathered limb to limb, and moulded, with every joint and member, into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection."

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Christian Duties in the various Relations of Life.* By T. Lewis, Islington. 12mo. pp. 362. London: Ward and Co.

THE venerable author of these discourses has now sustained, for nearly forty years, the pastoral charge of the church and congregation assembling at Union Chapel, Islington, and we rejoice in the evidence which this volume supplies, "that his eye is not dim, nor his natural force abated;" and though, as he informs his present flock, there are not now six individuals amongst them who united to choose him as their pastor, yet still he is surrounded by a numerous and deeply attached people, who know how to appreciate his public and pastoral labours, and his useful and devoted life. Of the character of his ministry the present volume supplies a fair and very favourable specimen. It contains six discourses on Christian Duties, viz.; the Observance of the Times; Duty of Christians at the present Time; Duties of the Heads of Families; Duties of Children and Servants; Duties of the Members of Churches; Duties of the Hearers of the Word. If not original and profound, the reader will find these discourses perspicuous, evangelical, and eminently practical, characterized by scriptural sentiments and faithful appeals to the understanding and the conscience, and well adapted to the circumstances of our times.

A former volume from the same pen, entitled *Christian Characteristics*, was very favourably received by the public; we wish that the present useful volume may have an equally extensive circulation, so that its esteemed author may be encouraged to publish a third and concluding volume, which he contemplates, on *Christian Privileges*.

*The Preacher's Determination: a Sermon delivered at Harley Street Chapel, Bow, Middlesex, on Lord's Day, December 8, 1839.* By Orlando Thomas Dobbin, B. A. of Trinity College, Dublin. pp. 40. Dinis.

THIS sermon was delivered on occasion of its esteemed author commencing his pastoral duties at Bow. The text is well chosen; "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." The exposition is good; though we differ from our author in the opinion that Apollos was chosen by his admirers as the head of a party. We are inclined rather to the opinion, that the false teachers were the chosen heads of the sections into which that church was divided, and that the apostle represented himself, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ, as leaders only by a figure of speech. Ταῦτα—μετασηματιστα εἰς ἑαυτον και Απολλω. Ch. iv. 6. A careful examination of this passage and its context, and a comparison of it with the 2d ch. and the character of the false teachers at Corinth, will, we believe, evince the correctness of this view. The limitation of the text we deem important, and our author has illustrated it copiously, as well as defined it strongly. The substance of the sermon is devoted to the IMPORTANCE of MAKING SUCH a RESOLVE as that of the apostle. Mr. D. argues, that it will help us to overcome the natural apprehensions connected with the office of an evangelist; will lead to an effective method of preaching; and that it will be pleasant to reflect upon for ever. In the conclusion, the preacher dwells on the reciprocal obligations of minister and people. He says,

"So long as I observe this determination of the apostle which you have heard me appropriate this morning, so long (ought) you to be my respectful and deferential hearers. By your cordial and unanimous suffrage I occupy the desk of the teacher: your relative position, by the providence of God, is the chair of the hearer; let it never become the chair of the scorner. I believe no man ever slights God's ministers without a cause, that does not suffer for it. We know who has said, 'Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm.'

"I beg you to bear these two or three things in memory: *That ignorant persons are invariably the most captious hearers*: for this many reasons may be assigned, I leave them to the suggestions of your own understanding. I beg you to bear in mind, further, that *I do not preach for criticism, but to save souls*; not to tickle the ear, but to mend the heart. When I stand up here, those solemn, those thrilling words, are ringing in my ear; 'Son of man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel: therefore hear the word from thy mouth, and give them warning from me,' &c. &c. Ezek. iii. 17, 18. \* \* \* I beg you to bear in mind the awful responsibility under which we both lie; this will rid you of the desire to criticise, and me of the fear of criticism. It is said to you, 'Take heed how ye hear,' just as well as to the preacher, 'Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.'"

Having given the above short specimen, taken at random, to afford some idea of our author's manner and faithfulness, we cordially recommend an attentive perusal of the sermon, and we trust that the valued minister who delivered it will long occupy the important post to which he has been called, and be eminently useful in diffusing a knowledge of the great salvation, and in building up a church, pure and spiritual, in which the grand principles and holy practices inculcated in the New Testament shall abound, and through which they shall, in that locality, be handed down to the latest posterity. We congratulate the church and congregation of Harley Street Chapel on their choice, while we sympathize with the loss our beloved brother's late flock at Arundel has sustained.

*The Millennium a Spiritual State, not a personal Reign.* By John Jefferson. Snow: London.

*The personal Reign of Christ.* By O. T. Dobbin, B. A. Minister of Harley Street Chapel, Bow. Second Edition. Dinnis: London.

WE hail with satisfaction the appearance of publications of this nature. It proves that our watchmen are awake, and are not only prompt to detect, but also powerful to expose, the devices of the enemy. Our opinions on the subject of the millennarian heresy are well known, and happy are we to say that they characterize the body whose name we bear, and are obtaining a more general acceptance with the church at large. We have lived to see millennarianism undergo an important change. Ten years ago it was recommended to the notice of the public by the powerful eloquence and rare enthusiasm of Edward Irving, whose personal and mental powers gathered around him a formidable band of credulous and confiding disciples, who imbibed his ardour and imitated his dogmatism. Now it does not possess an advocate who can command public attention, and its most zealous professors are to be found in the ranks of the Plymouth brethren.

We have read Mr. Jefferson's valuable discourse with pleasure, and are glad to meet him again on ground which he so efficiently occupies—that of practical and devotional truth. We doubt not that the statements in this address, if candidly weighed, will be productive of even more extensive good than that which the respected author states to have attended it on its delivery from the pulpit. While it will be especially acceptable to the members of his own congregation, we would hope it may find its way into other circles, and at once, by the importance of the subject discussed, by the weight and succinctness of the arguments employed, and the solemn urgency of its closing appeals, interest the careless, enlighten the ignorant, and establish the wavering.

The sermon is professedly an exposition of Rev. xx. 1—6, but, in fact, takes up the whole question.

The objections urged with considerable power against the doctrine of a personal reign, are the following:—

1. It is marked by the most glaring absurdities.

2. It is unsupported by the general tenor of divine revelation.
3. It is destructive of the essential properties of Christianity.
4. It is opposed to the scriptural doctrine of Christ's mediation.
5. It is equally derogatory to the glory of the Holy Ghost.
6. It entirely alters the character of christian expectation and hope.

At this stage of the controversy little new can be advanced. Truth, however, like gold, loses none of its value by being old. It is Mr. Jefferson's least merit that he has put the old coin into circulation under a new and attractive exterior.

Of Mr. Dobbin's sermon we expressed a favourable opinion in our former notice. The present is the second edition.

---

*Seven Hundred Domestic Hints in every branch of Family Management: combining Utility with Elegance, and Economy with the Enjoyment of Home. By a Lady. 32mo. London: C. Tilt.*

THIS neat little book is not in our way; but as friends of good sense, domestic order, and christian economy, we cordially recommend it to the notice of our female friends. Its instructive pages are enriched by citations from the best authorities.

---

*The Colonial Magazine and Commercial Maritime Journal. Edited by Robert Montgomery Martin, Esq. No. I. January, 1840. 8vo. pp. 152. London: Fisher, Son, and Co.*

WE are so deeply interested in the social and moral improvement of the British colonies, that we are prepared to welcome every publication that proposes to diffuse information respecting those important settlements.

The British public are already greatly indebted to Mr. Montgomery Martin for his laborious history of the British colonies, and under the editorship of a gentleman of his industry, intelligence, and perseverance, we confidently anticipate that this new periodical will be a repository of highly valuable and interesting information relating to the social and religious interests of the colonists themselves, and to the beathen around them.

The present number is an interesting specimen of the work, both as to typography and authorship, and we think it should be found on the table of every literary institution, and in circulation amongst the members of every book society.

We suspect, from some passages in the present number, that Mr. Martin has a feeling of resentment against certain authorities, on the ground of supposed neglect. He must permit us to urge upon him the importance of abstaining from political or religious partizanship if he wishes his work to have a general circulation amongst the friends of the colonies of all sects and parties.

---

*Discourses on Special Occasions, by the late Rev. Robert S. M'Al, LL.D. with a Sketch of his Life and Character. By the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Jackson and Walford.*

ALTHOUGH these beautiful volumes have only come to our hands as this sheet is going to press, yet we cannot refrain from announcing to our readers the fact of their publication, and the general nature of their contents.

The life and character of our lamented brother, with the prefatory notices from the pen of Dr. Wardlaw, occupy nearly 200 pages of the first volume, from the perusal of which we anticipate no ordinary gratification.

These are followed by a Funeral Sermon for Mr. Roby—a Discourse on Parental Duties—Three Discourses at the Opening of Chapels—Seven at the Ordination of Ministers—One at an Association of Ministers—Two for Home Missions, and Four in connection with Foreign Missions. Thus the two hand-

some volumes comprise nineteen discourses of the pre-eminently eloquent and gifted author, occupying more than 900 pages, besides the biographical and introductory matters which we have already described. We need not say that we shall be anxious to enter at an early opportunity on a lengthened examination of these deeply interesting relics of their sainted author.

#### THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

Glimpses of the Old World ; or Excursions on the Continent and in Great Britain. By Rev. John A. Clark, Rector of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, United States. In Two Vols. Royal 8vo. London : Bagster and Sons, Paternoster Row.

Millennarianism incompatible with our Lord's Sacerdotal Office : a Letter to the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, Rector of Watton, Herts. By George Hodson. 12mo. London : Nisbet and Co.

A Biblical and Theological Dictionary for Bible Classes, &c. With numerous Engravings. By Samuel Green, Walworth. 12mo. London : Wightman, Paternoster Row.

The Pagan Altar and Jehovah's Temple. An Essay. By R. Weaver. 12mo. London : Ward and Co.

Hours of Thought ; or Poetic Musings. By J. S. Hardy. 12mo. London : Harvey and Darton, Gracechurch Street.

Progress of the Confessional. 12mo. London : R. Groombridge.

On the Means and Manifestations of a Genuine Revival of Religion. An Address delivered before the United Presbytery, Edinburgh, in Rose Street Church, Edinburgh, on November 19th, 1839. By John Brown, D.D. Published at the Request of the Presbytery. Second Edition. 8vo. London : Hamilton, Adams and Co.

Fragments from the Study of a Pastor. By Gardiner Spring, D.D. New York. 18mo. London : Whittaker and Co.

The Day-Spring from on High ; or the Lord Jesus Christ exhibited to the Sinner as the only Source of Peace and Salvation. 32mo. Edinburgh : William Oliphant.

Memoirs of Felix Neff, John F. Oberlin, and Bernhard Overberg. Translated from the German, by Mrs. Sydney Williams. 8vo. Published by the Society for the Promotion of Popular Instruction. Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

Memoir of Thomas Cranfield. By his Son. Fisher and Son, Newgate Street.

The Friend of Ireland : containing an Exposure of the Errors and Superstitions of the Church of Rome. By P. Dixon Hardy, M.R.I.A. With numerous Wood Engravings. 4to. London : R. Groombridge, Paternoster Row.

Popular Airs and Sacred Melodies, adapted for social singing ; with Hymn Tunes and Anthems arranged for Congregational Worship. 4to. London : R. Groombridge, Paternoster Row.

Discourses on Special Occasions. By the late Rev. Robert S. M'All, LL.D. With a Sketch of his Life and Character. By the Rev. R. Wardlaw, D.D. In Two Volumes, 8vo. London : Jackson and Walford, St. Paul's Church-yard.

The Outpouring of the Spirit. A Discourse delivered June 6th, 1839, in the Baptist Meeting-house, Saltash, before the South Devon and Cornwall Association. By L. P. Hewlett. 12mo. London : Ward and Co.

The Union Harmonist : a Selection of Sacred Music, consisting of Original and Standard Pieces, Anthems, &c. Suitable for the use of Sunday Schools, Congregations, and Musical Societies. Arranged by T. Clark, Canterbury. Part I. London : Sunday School Union, Paternoster Row.

The Whigs and the Dissenters : a Letter to Edward Baines, Esq. M. P. 8vo. Jackson and Walford.

The Tendency of Socinian Principles to lead to Infidelity. A Sermon, by Andrew Russell, M.A. of Haddington. 12mo. Edinburgh : J. Johnstone.

An Address delivered on laying the Foundation of Salem Chapel, Burley-in-Wharfedale, on Monday, Oct. 14, 1839. By Edward Jukes, Leeds. 12mo.

## TRANSACTIONS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES, AT HOME AND ABROAD.

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE LETTER OF DR. URWICK RESPECTING IRELAND.

(To the Editor.)

MY DEAR BROTHER,—I read the energetic appeal of Dr. Urwick on behalf of Ireland, in your last number, with great interest, and in his statement of the painful inadequacy of all existing evangelical operations to meet the wide and pressing necessities of that benighted country, I entirely agree. I cordially concur also in opinion with our esteemed and judicious brother, that missionary operations, conducted on the sound scriptural principles and with the elastic spirit of *Congregationalism*, are admirably adapted to the present peculiarities in the social and moral aspect of that kingdom.

I am, however, impressed with the apprehension, that from the letter of Dr. Urwick conclusions will be drawn by many of your readers, alike unjust to the congregational churches of Britain, and to the institution through which their kind (though inadequate) assistance has been rendered to the sister island.

The Irish Evangelical Society, which has been in active operation for more than five and twenty years, and with which I have been officially connected for nearly half that period, although not denominational, has done good service to the cause of Congregationalism in Ireland. In proof of this I need only adduce the following facts:—

When the Society was formed, the number of congregational churches in that country was *eleven*; it is now *twenty-eight*; and of these seventeen newly raised societies, *fourteen* have resulted from the labours of its agents; and of the additional three, two are now supported by its funds.

Of these twenty-eight churches, not more than five are capable of supporting their pastors; our respected brethren presiding over other three, are sustained by their own resources, and all the remainder derive their incomes, wholly or in part, from the Irish Evangelical Society.

Beside these pastors of churches, who also occupy wide circles of itinerant labour, the Society entirely supports five additional congregational ministers, who are wholly engaged in missionary service; a class of agents the Committee are most anxious, as their funds will admit, to multiply.

The Society also employs about twenty Scripture readers and expositors, (a most useful and much required class of evangelists,) and these, with three or four exceptions, are all members of congregational churches, and valuable auxiliaries to their pastors.

To these particulars I may add, that, during the period of the Society's existence, about *sixteen new congregational* places of worship have been raised, and towards the erection of every one of these, the Society has afforded liberal assistance. The students also who have been educated in the congregational seminary at Dublin, with a single exception, have been adopted by the Society, and now supported as its agents.

The Irish Evangelical Society, like the London Missionary Society, was formed on comprehensive principles, that invited the union and co-operation of all classes of christian men; but Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists have since established separate institutions, formed upon their several distinctive peculiarities, for the advancement of their separate interests, and these they prosecute with vigour and efficiency. The funds of our Society are, therefore, now derived almost exclusively from the congregational churches of Britain, (with occasional aid from our brethren of the Scottish Secession,) and with

perfect equity they are applied, in the same proportion, to the support and extension of *congregational interests* in Ireland. Whether, in the altered and peculiar condition of religious parties, it be desirable for the Society to assume a *denominational*, rather than continue that general character which was deemed best at the time of its formation, is a subject on which I should deem it improper, on this occasion, to express an opinion; but it is one that I think demands the early, candid, and most serious consideration of the Committee.

In conclusion, while I have been anxious, in this brief statement, to perform an act of justice to the pastors and members of our churches by whom the funds of the Irish Evangelical Society have been supplied, and to the successive Committees by whom they have been administered, I cannot too strongly express my entire sympathy with our devoted brother, Dr. Urwick in his anxious desire for a large increase of missionaries of our own faith and order, who shall go through the length and breadth of the land, making known the way of salvation to the millions of Ireland who are ready to perish.

I am, my dear Brother, yours faithfully,

London, Jan. 20, 1840.

ARTHUR TIDMAN.

P. S. I wish this statement to be considered as unofficial, as it is quite unauthorized by the Committee, and, indeed, unknown to any individual but the writer.

#### CHRISTMAS EXAMINATION OF THE STUDENTS AT SPRING HILL COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

The above examination took place at the College on the 12th, 13th, 16th, 17th, and 18th days of December last, under the superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Redford, of Worcester, and the Rev. Joseph Gilbert, of Nottingham. The former gentleman presided in the classical department; the latter in those of Mathematics, English Grammar, Philology, Hebrew, and Theology. The following are the testimonies given on the occasion. In explanation of the later date of the third paper, it should be observed, that owing to the regretted absence of the Rev. John Burder, of Stroud, who was unable to attend, the examination of the papers in Hebrew and Theology was kindly undertaken by the Rev. Joseph Gilbert, who, not having time to peruse them while he remained in Birmingham, was obliged to forward his testimonial from Nottingham.

##### I.—CLASSICAL DEPARTMENT.

With great pleasure I hereby express my satisfaction at the results of the present examination. It has been conducted upon a plan calculated to put fully and fairly to the test the abilities and acquirements of the students. They have executed the work assigned them in a manner which reflects high credit upon their diligence, and affords pleasing promise of their future usefulness. My expectations of the accuracy with which the examination questions would be answered have been fully realized, and in some instances surpassed.

GEO. REDFORD.

Birmingham, Dec. 17, 1839.

##### II.—MATHEMATICAL DEPARTMENT.

It will not, in reporting the result of my examination of the classes in *Plane Trigonometry*, *Geometry*, and *Algebra*, be necessary to explain to the Committee the course which has been adopted. The printed papers prepared for the Christmas examination, will be laid before them. It may not be improper, however, to remind the Committee, that the students are unacquainted with their contents, till the time when they are individually required, without reference to books, to write on the respective subjects. This mode, it will be admitted, is a complete test of their substantial acquisitions. The Committee will also remember the brevity of the session now coming to its close, and the various other objects of study which have demanded a large share of their attention.

The students of *Trigonometry* have acquired for themselves a very honourable distinction.

These, as well as their associates generally, in the senior class, have likewise, with some diversity of attainment, acquitted themselves meritoriously in *Geometry*. Some of the junior class, in the same science, have not failed to give good proof of their ability, nor is there ground of dissatisfaction with any of them.

In *Algebra*, the success has not been so distinguished; though the seniors and some of the junior class, have shown a clear conception and considerable facility; while of the rest, considering their limited opportunity for familiarizing themselves with ideas entirely new to them, it may be observed, that they have no reason to be discouraged. Increased acquaintance with the subjects of thought introduced, will, with practice, enable them soon to surmount all difficulty.

On the whole, I can sincerely assure the Committee, that I have been greatly gratified with the proofs of talent and energy, which I have witnessed; and I cannot conclude, without congratulating them as well on the unremitting diligence of the students, as on the zeal, ability, and kind attention of their tutors, which cannot but win the esteem and confidence of their pupils.

Spring Hill College, Dec. 18, 1839.

JOSEPH GILBERT.

### III.—ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND PHILOLOGY—HEBREW—BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION AND EXEGESIS—THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

I have examined with care the papers committed to me, in the regretted absence of some other gentlemen of the Committee, arranged under the following subjects, each including two classes of questions adapted to the proficiency of the students:—English Grammar and Philology; Hebrew; Biblical Introduction and Exegesis; the Evidences of Christianity. Since, were I to give separate reports, under each of these branches of instruction, it would, for the most part, be necessary to repeat the observations; I think it will not be requisite to do more, than to state the impression derived from the whole.

The respective courses appear to me to be very judicious, interesting, and important; adapted to ensure sound as well as extensive and appropriate learning. I have myself enjoyed much the review of them.

It would be anticipated that the papers written upon the questions in these several departments of knowledge, would indicate considerable diversity of attainment in the students, arising not only from differences of mental power, but of previous opportunity. But it is with unfeigned gratification, and the utmost sincerity, that I can commend the evident assiduity and solid acquisition of even those who have had, apparently, the fewest advantages, while of several, it is bare justice to remark, that there are striking proofs of ample endowments of mind, combined with accurate and extensive learning, as far as they have proceeded. Nor is it the less pleasing to observe, on questions which plainly admit of different conclusions, the manifest independence of judgment exercised, or otherwise the modesty which suspends decision, till further opportunity for careful investigation.

The Committee will bear in mind the mode of examination pursued in these as in the other branches; which, while it suffers none to escape in the generalities of a class examination, taxes to the uttermost the resources and the readiness of the most accomplished.

In conclusion, we cannot but confidently anticipate, that the mode of study adopted in Spring Hill College, followed out to the extent which time and health permit, will result in a supply of ministers amply furnished to meet the growing demands of the church and of the world, and, while indulging this hope, we would earnestly pray that amidst the fascination or labour of acquiring stores of knowledge, our young friends may be ever distinguished not less for their devotional spirit than for their other qualifications.

JOSEPH GILBERT.

Nottingham, Jan. 1, 1840.

N  
situate  
zealous  
Chest  
to the  
the en  
princi  
associ  
the st  
Willi  
servic  
and th  
In  
Fletch  
dresse  
memb  
for th  
Park  
of Ch  
offere  
esteem  
Th  
Bowe  
excite

LAY

O  
chap  
was  
a con  
eren  
Deal  
a ve  
servi  
of th  
adjo  
gran  
and  
vere  
ston  
shal  
illus  
volu  
ches  
con  
spe  
by  
min  
an  
I  
ing  
Aft  
usu  
Mr

## NEW CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, SUTTON, CHESHIRE.

Nearly five-and-twenty years ago the destitute village of Sutton, which is situate about half way between Liverpool and Chester, was visited by some zealous friends belonging to the congregation meeting in Queen Street Chapel, Chester, for the purpose of establishing a Sabbath-school, and reading sermons to the villagers. Their faith and patience was long tried, but their success in the end was so encouraging, as to lead to the erection of a commodious chapel, principally through the exertions of the congregation with which they are associated, and to a liberal annual grant from the Cheshire County Union, for the support of a minister in the place. Providence having directed the Rev. William Clarke to this important station, and success attending his labours, services were held on Tuesday, December 17th, for the formation of a church and the ordination of the pastor.

In the morning, an introductory discourse was delivered by the Rev. Robert Fletcher, of Manchester, after which the Rev. Samuel Luke, of Chester, addressed the church, and administered the Lord's Supper to the newly recognized members, together with many others from neighbouring churches. The service for the ordination was held in the afternoon; the Rev. Robert Roberts, of Parkgate, commenced with reading the Scriptures and prayer; the Rev. S. Luke, of Chester, proposed the usual questions; the Rev. S. Healey, of Harlegrove, offered up the ordination prayer, and the Rev. J. Turner, of Knutsford, (the esteemed Secretary of the Cheshire Union,) delivered the charge.

The sermon to the people was preached in the evening by the Rev. Samuel Bowen, of Macclesfield. The services of the day were well attended, and excited great interest in the neighbourhood.

## LAYING OF THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF AN INDEPENDENT CHAPEL, CASTLECROFT, BURY, LANCASHIRE.

On Christmas-day, (Dec. 25th, 1839,) the foundation-stone of a new chapel for the church and congregation now assembling at Shore Fields, Bury, was laid by James Kershaw, Esq. Alderman, of Manchester, in the presence of a considerable number of spectators, some of whom had looked forward to that event with prayerful anxiety. The service was commenced by the Rev. James Deakin, of Stand, with singing and prayer; after which the stone was laid, and a very neat and impressive address, adapted to the season of the year, the service itself, and the object that those had in view who laboured for the erection of that house, was delivered by Mr. Alderman Kershaw. The meeting then adjourned to the New Connection Methodists' Chapel, (which had been kindly granted for the occasion) where the service was continued by singing a hymn and reading the Scriptures. Afterwards a most appropriate address was delivered by the Rev. William Jones, of Bolton, from Gen. xxviii. 22, "And this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be God's house: and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee," in which was eloquently illustrated the ancient and scriptural mode of supporting the cause of God by a voluntary appropriation of a certain amount of our substance: also the soul-cheering truths, that in all ages God had a people on earth, that with these he condescended to meet, and that they ever desired to have houses or places for special meeting with him. The service was concluded with praise and prayer, by the Rev. William Roseman, the minister at Shore Fields, after which the ministers and a number of friends repaired to the adjoining school-room, where an excellent refection was provided by the ladies of the congregation.

In connection with the above service there was a public tea-party in the evening (Rev. W. Roseman in the chair) when between 3 and 400 persons sat down. After tea the Rev. E. H. Nolan, of Manchester, addressed the meeting in his usually eloquent and happy strain. Addresses were also delivered by the Rev. Mr. Reynolds, of the Methodists' New Connection, and others.

In the course of the evening Mr. H. Tipping presented to the Minister and Church, for use in the pulpit, a large Bible, Dr. Watts's Hymn-book, and the Rev. W. Roby's Selection, splendidly but chastely bound, along with a handsome case for their preservation.

Altogether the services were of the most interesting character, and will long be remembered by those who were present. Many prayers have been offered to the great Disposer of events on behalf of this infant and promising cause; and it is hoped that when the destitute state of the dense population of that end of the town, and the number of individuals that have been induced to attend the ministry of the word in their present uncomfortable place of worship, are taken into consideration, in connection with the great efforts which have been made to raise the necessary funds for the commencement of the chapel now in progress, that the pious rich in other places will not withhold their aid. The land has been liberally and gratuitously surrendered by a member of the Church of England, and renewed for 99 years, for a small acknowledgment by the Right Hon. the Earl of Derby. About £500. have already been subscribed, but considerably above £500. more will be required. The chapel is 48 feet square, with a school-room beneath. For further particulars, see *Congregational Magazine*, p. 322, vol. ii. and p. 535. vol. iii. of the New Series.

#### ORDINATIONS, &c.

On Tuesday, Jan. 28, a deeply interesting service was held at Upper Clapton, Middlesex, to recognize the settlement of the Rev. Algernon Wells in the pastoral charge of the Independent church and congregation assembling in that suburban village.

Dr. H. F. Burder, of Hackney, conducted the introductory devotions. Dr. Fletcher, of Stepney, delivered an elaborate discourse, explanatory of the principles and constitution of congregational churches; Dr. J. Pye Smith, of Hoxmerton, offered the designatory prayer; and Mr. Binney, of the Weigh House Chapel, addressed affectionate counsels to the pastor and his flock; and Mr. Blackburn, of Pentonville, closed the exercises with prayer. We are happy to state, that although our honoured brother's feeble health has compelled him to relinquish a portion of his duties as Secretary to the Congregational Union and Colonial Mission, yet that those important Institutions will continue to enjoy his able superintendence and enlightened counsels.

On Dec. 10, 1839, the Rev. W. F. Buck, (late of Harleston,) was recognized as pastor of the Congregational church at Burton-upon-Trent. The Rev. J. Corbin, of Derby, commenced the service by reading and prayer; the Rev. J. Wild, of Nottingham, delivered the introductory discourse; the Rev. W. Tait, of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, proposed the usual questions; the Rev. J. Shaw offered special prayer for the pastor; the Rev. J. Gawthorn, of Derby, addressed the pastor; and the Rev. J. A. James, of Birmingham, preached to the people. The Rev. Messrs. Cooke, Ault, Herbert, Owen, and Sladden engaged in the devotional parts of the service. The friends of the Congregational Interest in this town have determined to erect a new and more commodious place of worship; a very liberal subscription was entered into for this purpose on the day of Mr. B.'s recognition.

The  
siderati  
and ant

His  
cipal d  
mission  
trinity  
they ha  
Morel  
Science  
their d

His  
the M  
but hi  
taken  
" that  
be drav  
of Eng  
with t  
subject  
come  
efforts

We  
it. M  
Thorn  
other  
have a  
Dr. C  
Arche  
struct  
lectur  
are ye  
nected  
a cou  
like t  
is not  
wood,  
lectur  
the C  
callin  
opini  
them  
God

## INTELLIGENCE.

## PROGRESS OF SOCIALISM.

The Bishop of Exeter, on Friday, 24th January, brought under the consideration of the House of Lords the progress and proceedings of this atheistical and anti-social sect.

His Lordship stated, that they had divided Great Britain into fourteen principal districts, which were represented in an annual congress. That their missionaries, who preach that religion, marriage, and private property, are the trinity of social evils, visit regularly 350 towns throughout the kingdom. That they have a Tract Committee, and publish a weekly journal called *The New Moral World*. That they have built what they call Saloons and Halls of Science, in many of the large towns, spacious and attractive edifices, in which their demoralizing principles are promulgated.

His Lordship's very long speech is characterized by much bitterness against the Marquis of Normanby for not taking *legal* measures for their suppression, but his Lordship failed to inform the House what steps the clergy have taken to counteract the mischief. Lord Normanby very properly remarked, "that for his part, he should conceive, that the first persons whose notice would be drawn to this extraordinary state of things would be the clergy of the Church of England. They, he should expect, would be able to meet such a moral evil with the most effectual weapons. But if any points of information on the subject had met the eyes of the clergy, all he could say was, that they had not come to his knowledge." We, like his Lordship, are uninformed as to the efforts of the clergy to counteract, by moral means, this growing evil.

We are happy to know that dissenting ministers have not been indifferent to it. Mr. Ewing, at Halifax, Mr. Giles, at Leeds, Mr. Mather, at Bilston, Mr. Thornton, at Darlington, Mr. Legge, at Reading, occur to us amongst many other of our brethren in the provinces, who, both from the platform and the press, have ably and successfully withstood these missionaries of atheism. In London, Dr. Cox, Dr. Styles, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Woodwork, Mr. Aldis, Mr. Archer, Mr. Blackburn and Mr. Fletcher, in connection with the Christian Instruction Society, have, with great ability refuted their opinions, in a course of lectures at Eagle Street Chapel, Holborn, and Messrs. Steane Stovel, and Burnet are yet to follow to complete it. We are happy to add, that gentlemen connected with the City Mission, both clergymen and laymen, have just opened a course of Lectures at the Mechanics' Institution, Chancery Lane, which, like those at Eagle Street, are crowded to excess. The syllabus of the course is not at hand, but we recollect that Mr. Ainslie, Mr. Baptist Noel, Mr. Garwood, Mr. Isaac Taylor, and Mr. Mathews, are amongst the number of the lecturers. How happy would it be for his lordship the Bishop of Exeter, and the Church of England, if, instead of exhausting his powers in Parliament, in calling for the sword of the magistrate to punish the promulgators of these opinions, he would condescend, like a true successor of the apostles, to refute them with those weapons which are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of the strongholds of the enemy.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The Rev. T. Morell, who is about to relinquish the Theological Chair of Coward College at the close of the present session, purposes, if health permit, to redeem the pledge long since given to many of his friends, that he would embrace the first season of leisure from official duties to prepare for the press "*Memoirs of the Life and Times of Doddridge.*" Valuable as is the biography of that excellent man, published soon after his death, so much additional light has since been thrown on his personal and social history, that a new work on the subject has been considered by many highly desirable. The Editor embraces this opportunity of requesting that any friends who may possess documents illustrative either of the personal history of Doddridge or the ecclesiastical history of the period in which he flourished, would favour him with the loan of such documents, or with extracts from them.

The Rev. J. H. Hinton has in the press an *Essay on Human Responsibility.*  
The Rev. J. Blackburn will publish in a few days "*Marriage as taught by the Socialists.*"

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND MINOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Favours have been received from the Rev. Dr. J. Pye Smith—Rev. Messrs. W. Davis—E. Leighton—T. Atkins—J. Peggs—F. Watt—G. Taylor—W. F. Buck—T. Styles—R. Ashton—O. T. Dobbin—J. Clapp—S. Thodey—Thos. Morell—B. Brook—J. Bevan—James Turner—J. Watson—A. Tidman.

Also from Sir C. E. Smith, Bart.—Messrs. J. Mettham—J. Milner—J. Smith—E. Phillips—Edwards—Z. J. G.—Nemo.

The Map that appears in our January number was reversed for the sake of introducing vignettes. This the artist should have indicated by the introduction of the cardinal points. The colony as it appears on the map is south and the ocean north, which reverses the usual order.

In the account which was sent us last month from Bury, in Lancashire, of the re-opening of New Road Chapel, is an error (page 69 of our last Number) which requires correction. The Rev. Thomas Hill succeeded the Rev. Alfred Bishop as *Classical and Hebrew*, and not as Theological Tutor in Homerton College, in the year 1806. In 1808, he received the accession to his tutorship of the paternal and pastoral office of Residence; and he was removed by death in August, 1813. An excellent Sermon on that occasion was preached and published by Dr. Winter. The present Divinity Tutor, Dr. Pye Smith, was appointed the *Classical and Resident Tutor* in 1800; he entered upon the duties of that station on January, 5, 1801; and, in the early part of 1805, he was called to the department in which, by the goodness of God, he continues to labour to this day.

Sincerely do we wish that this were the only part of that article which requires our notice. But we regret to acknowledge that the gentleman who sent it, has misled us by the insertion of a clause reflecting upon "a third interest" which has been formed in that place, and for the use of which, a new Chapel has been commenced under most respectable auspices (vide p. 133). That passage is calculated to produce on the mind of every reader not acquainted with the facts now before us, an impression which we think the existing circumstances will not justify. We must beg our correspondents not to make our work the vehicle of communicating party opinions to the public. The great object of our labours is to *unite* our churches, and not to increase alienations where they unhappily exist. We beg our friends at Bury to listen to the exhortation which Joseph addressed to his brethren, "See that ye fall not out by the way."